

coll 57
4

A
R E V I E W
O F
Mr. G L A S S's Observes
O N T H E
Original Constitution
O F T H E
Christian Church;
In a Letter to him.

By T H O M A S A Y T O N E.

Qua ex causa necessario apud nos fit, ut per singulos annos seniores & prepositi in unum conveniamus, ad disponenda ea quæ curæ nostræ commissa sunt, &c.

Cyp. Ep. 75.

I beseech you, Brethren, by the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same Thing, and that there be no Divisions among you, &c. 1 Cor. i. 10.

E D I N B U R G H,

Printed for *John Paton*, and sold at his Shop; and by *Alexander Beck* and *Alexander Mitchel* Booksellers in *Perth*, and by *Thomas Mitchel* Bookseller in *Dundee*. M. DCC. XXXI.



A



fore

hav

hav

wh

A

the

sefs

Arg

and

of

self

A Review of Mr. *Glass's* Observes on the Original Constitution of the Christian Church ; in a Letter to him.

S I R,



Received yours, wherein you signify, that I have taken some Notice of your *Explication* of the *Proposition*, and that you expected I would have done the like to your *Answer* to the *Defence* of *National Churches*, and Speech before the *Commission*.

As to the *First*, I am still of the Mind that I have examined every Thing material in it, and have not seen, as yet, any suitable Answer to what is said.

As to the *Second*, I own it was printed before the Publication of my Book ; but must freely confess, that it appeared to me, to have so little of the Argument in it, and so much of ludicrous Banter and Invective diffused itself throughout the whole of the Performance, that I could not allow myself to imagine, that it was either a suitable Reply

to that Book, or becoming the Gravity of the Subject.

As to the *Third*, viz. your *Speech*, I see as little in it to have Weight with any Man, who desires Reason or Revelation to determine him in what he embraces: As to what relates to *Acts 15*. I shall consider it in the proper Place, seeing I had not Occasion to peruse your *Speech*, before my Book was gone to the Prels. Mean while, I shortly take Notice of two or three Things advanced therein, p. 4, and 5. And, 1. You are not wanting in Charity to say, "That the Commission will not affirm these Parishes and their Overseers are of the same Kind with the first Christian Churches or Congregations, and their Presbytery." That is, that the Parishes and Ministers of this Church are not of the same Nature and Kind with the first Christian Churches planted by the Apostles: But the Commission have subscribed the *Confession of Faith*, and *Formula*; and under their Hand declared, the Constitution of this Church is founded upon, and agreeable to the Word of God, &c. Thus you must either imagine they were a Sett of Men, who subscribed one Thing and believed another, than which there can be no more Unchristian Charge; or else, they did affirm that these Parishes are of the same Kind and Nature with the first Christian Churches.

But then, to confirm that our Parishes are different in Kind from the first Christian Churches, you alledge, "The Magistrate has divided his Subjects into Parcels, to be taught by so many Teachers, &c." But, will the Magistrate's interposing his Authority, for the regular Distribution of Congregations, and giving a legal Maintenance



tenance to Pastors, alter the Nature of a Church or Congregation, so as that there should be a specifick Difference between these and the Apostolick Churches? Will our Mercy, in having a supreme Magistrate to be a nursing Father to the Church, be so much to its Hurt and Detriment, as to make it differ in Kind from the first Christian Churches? Or, will an external cumulative Power alter the Nature of a Church, where the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government of Christ are preserved and maintained, so as to make it alter in Kind from the Apostolick Institution? These Assertions want Proof: For, tho' it is not a Person's Living in the local Bounds of a Parish, that constitutes him a Member of that Congregation; yet it is most expedient, and agreeable to the general Precepts of the Gospel, and Apostolical Pattern, that Congregations should be distinguished by the respective Bounds of their Habitations; this being most for their Edification, and what both gives Minister and People easier Access to perform their mutual Duties: Thus, the first Christian Churches were distinguished and designed by their respective Cities; and we have not the least Countenance from Scripture, that he who had his Habitation in one City, was a stated and ordinary Member in a Church which was in another. And as little do we read, that Persons set up then to gather a Church out of Churches, tho' this Principle has still induced its Admirers to exclaim against regular Distributions of Congregations.

Again, I find another Thing alledged, *viz.*
 “ That the first Christian Churches were gathered
 “ only by the Gospel, and were Disciples of Christ
 “ voluntarily associated, &c.” p. 5. But this goes
 on

on a Supposition, that a Kingdom or Nation which has been brought into Church-Order by the Preaching of the Gospel, and made to abandon Heathenism and embrace the Christian Religion, and thereupon were baptised, and after them for several Generations their Seed and Offspring; *that* these are in the same Condition with such as are without, or in a State of Paganism. *Scotland* was first brought in by the Preaching of the Gospel, and so their Seed and Offspring are still reputed Members of the visible Church, and are under the Seal of the Covenant. When a Nation is thus brought in, and by a voluntary Condescension submit themselves to the Laws of Christ, their Children are federally holy, and have a Right to all the external Privileges of the Covenant, unless they be cut off by some Moral or Physical Impediment: Thus the Children of the *Jews* were all circumcised, even tho' their Parents were not to be accounted real Believers or visible Saints; and the Covenant under both Dispensations is substantially the same. In a Word, wherever the People do with mutual Consent gather into settled Congregations ordinarily every Lord's Day, to hear the Word purely preached, and perform the Acts of religious Worship, according to Christ's Institution, do profess their Subjection thereunto, and bind themselves and their Children to continue therein, as they do in Baptism; these are true Churches, tho' there may be many Corruptions and evil Practices among them, as there were in the Church of *Corinth*: This much is owned by the *New-England* Ministers, in their *Answer* to the 32. *Question*, p. 24, &c. and by the *Apology* for the Church-Covenant, p. 36, &c. But my designed Brevity

will

which will not allow me to enlarge ; only you may reconcile your Notions on this Head with the Independent Ministers formerly mentioned, in their *Platform* of Church-discipline, *Chap. 11. § 4. & Chap. 17. § 3, 6, 8.* and you will see how far they allow the Countenance of the civil Magistrate.

Sir, I come now to offer my Thoughts on your *Observes*, and in the Entry give you my Promise, that I am not to render Railing for Railing, nor treat the Persons of any Men with Burlesque or ignominious Names, as you have done.

Your first general *Observe*, p. 14. contains a Charge against me for affecting the Spirit of such as have contended for classical Presbytery, which you imagine to be somewhat different from that which they discover in other Controversies. But, how is this made out ? 1. *Say you*, "It was always their Way to fly to humane Authority, when they came to a Pinch, in a Question, which is only to be decided by the Word of God, &c." But, allow me to say, the Charge is false, and I desire you to make it good. General Charges, without condescending on Particulars, in their several Circumstances, are calumnious, and cross to the very Spirit of the Gospel. I know no Presbyterian Writer who does not plead for the sacred Oracles being the sole Judge in all Points of Religion, and in every essential Branch of the New-Testament Constitution : I own, I prefer one divine Church Testimony to ten Arguments, and one good Argument before ten humane Testimonies ; Yet I must still think, that both Reason and humane Testimony deserve the Place of Under-proofs, and in this Brevity where they are only urged. Scripture itself saith, *that in the Multitude of Counsellors there is Safety ;* and

and so we are not ashamed to bring a Cloud of Witnesses along with us in our Disputes, and reverence their Judgments, when they bring both Scripture and solid Reasons along with them. Thus, while you condemn us, you make light of *Solomon's* Judgment, and take Care to prefer your own Notions of Things, before all Men both of Piety and Learning.

Nay, you further tell me, That I am sometimes vain to use the Authority of *Dr. Owen*: What then? O, say you, "If his Authority be a good Argument in some Cases, why not in others also?" Sir, 1. The very Points on which I have used him, are on the Head of Independency, and so I take an Argument from the Mouth of an Adversary. But, 2. I own, I reverence the Judgment of so learned and pious a Divine, in what I find to be his stated and permanent Way of thinking, and so, will not slightly reject it: Nay, this great Man's stated and permanent Way of thinking of Church-Government, was not so much in favour of Independency as some have represented him to the Credulous. As an Evidence of this, I shall set down a few Lines from the History of his Life prefixed to the first Volume of his Sermons printed Anno 1720. The Words are, p. 33, 34. "I have been the longer in the Extract of the Doctor's Opinion about Church-government, because it shews (whatever might have been his Sentiments when younger) how much he agreed with the Protestant Churches, that of *England* excepted, in this Point in the latter Part of his Days, and that, had others been of his Mind, the Differences between those called Presbyterians and Independents might have easily been reconciled."

Cloud of
, and re
ing bot
a them
ake ligh
to prefe
all Men
ometime
: Wh
a goo
in othe
which
dency, an
of an A
Judgme
t I find
thinking
this gre
inking
n favou
ed him
I shall
his Lib
ns printe
"I hav
e Doct
because
entimen
with a
excepte
s Days
the Diff
rians an
econcile
H

" He was of so healing a Temper in this Matter,
" that I heard him say, before a Person of Quali-
" ty and others, he could readily join with Preby-
" tery, as it was exercised in *Scotland*." Thus his
Judgment is stronger in Favours of Presbytery than
Independency ; or at least we may justly conclude,
that, had he been a Member in the Church of *Scot-*
land, he would not have broke off from her Com-
munion, or been instrumental in raising a Schism
therein : Besides, his Practice, while in *Scotland*,
was the downright Reverse of this.

Your second Charge, p. 4. is, ' My telling Sto-
" ries of the Divisions of the Independents ; and
" then you fall hard on *Bastwick* and *Edwards*,
" and arraign them as vile Writers, without gi-
" ving the least Reason for your so doing, &c." To this I reply, 1. That in my 5th Argument for
the establishing the Subordination of Judicator-
ies, p. 328. I laid before you several absurd,
yet plain Consequences from Independent Prin-
ciples. These you have never touched ; but on-
ly carp, because the Facts alledged were practical
Confirmations of these Conclusions. And to be
up with these Authors, whose Authority I made
Use of for confirming them, you must bring their
Names under Reproach, and characterize Mr.
Bastwick and *Edwards* (and on the same Account
Mr. *Prenn* and Mr. *Baxter*, whose Authorities I
also used) as vile Writers. But what Evidence
have you given of the Vileness of these great
Men ? None, if it be not that they wrote
against Independency, and so all such must have
the same Character. Thus, while you charge
the Presbyterians with altering their Spirit in the
Dispute with you, you yourself outdo all the
B Presby-

Presbyterian Writers I ever read, or saw, on this Subject. In a Word, I had still good Ground to think that these Premises, from which absurd Inferences are plainly deducible, were not Truths; seeing Premises must still partake of the Nature of their just Conclusions.

2. He must be a Stranger to the present Situation of *England*, that does not see, even at this Day, too much of the same Effects casting up, which had their Beginnings in a former Age, through the Want of the due Exercise of Discipline among the Dissenters. So the long Tract of Time since these Writers were on the Stage, *leaves them yet unconfuted*, tho' the contrary is alledged by you. Besides, you might have spared your Story, in comparing the Presbyterians to the Heathens, and taking it for granted, that your Principles are as little subject to absurd Consequences, as these of Christianity, which were reproached by the Infidel World.

Your third Charge, p. 5. is, the Misapplication of Metaphysics to 1 *Cor.* 14. 23, 24. But pray, Sir, first discover the Fallacy of my Reasoning on these Texts, and then, in your next, you may rank me among the Company of Sophists. Besides, compare your own beloved metaphysical Distinction, *the Body assembling, and the Assembly of that Body*, and what I have said on these Scriptures, and see which of us have most plyed that Art: And, that the Reader may judge, let him compare p. 5, 6. of your *Proposition*, with p. 82, 343. of my Book. As for your ludicrous Treatment, I despise it, it being the common Burden of all your Performances.

Your

Your 4th Charge, p. 6. is, "That I follow the Example of these Writers in the intolerable Confidence which they express in an Argument they sometimes use when Scripture fails them, viz. That it would be an Imputation too injurious to Christ and his Apostles, to suppose that they order otherwise than according to the Presbyterian Scheme." These are your Words, and I desire you may fix the Charge, lest every one who reads them call them a Calumny; and so justly reckon, that, while you are recommending a Christian Temper, you can at the same Time make false and unchristian Charges. That our blessed Lord might have revealed another Plan or Scheme of Government in his House, than what he hath done, I believe no Presbyterian will deny; but when he has given us such Examples, Precepts and Rules in his Word, as are evident to every One who reads it, One may justly say, that he, who refuseth the plain and immediate Consequences drawn from these, acts injuriously to Christ and his Apostles. And let me add, that it is full Time for you to alledge that Scripture-Proof has failed us, when you have once answered the Scripture-arguments that have been adduced against you. And as to what you further assert, about our bringing all Manner of Reflections against the *Independents*, and that we *speake to them with as infallible an Air, as the Pope does unto the Protestants*; It very strongly verifies the Scots Proverb, *First give the heavy Stroke, and then raise the loud Cry*. We have treat the Persons of our Independent Brethren, with all Tendernefs and Christian Love, in the Disputes we have had with them; and I dare you to shew the Contrary.

Nay, can you refuse, without a Blush, that you have made positive Charges in your *Answer to the Defence of national Churches*, even when you have given no better Argument than your own Assertion? Have you not the most ludicrous Expressions and unbecoming Invectives against us in your *Observes*; terming the whole Church *Babylon*, and particular Persons *Perversers*, nay, *malicious Perversers of the Scripture*, *Detainers of the Truth in Unrighteousness*, and the like? Have you brought no unchristian Charges against us in the *Explic.* of your *Prop.* of which I had too often Occasion to remind you? In a Word, as we disclaim Popish Infallibility, so we hold a positive Certainty of our Principles, in Opposition to *Libertinism* and Uncertainty.

Thus I have gone through your first general Libel, which has all the Characteristicks of a Calumny, seeing you have never offered any other Voucher for your Allegations, than your bare Assertion, without quoting one Page of my Book, or any others.

In your second general Observe, p. 7. you tell me, That "you was of the Opinion, that it was not meet to manage the Cause of *Classical Presbytery* against the *Episcopalians* and *Independents*, in one and the same Book; and now you were confirmed of it." But from whence does this Confirmation arise? Alas! I now find I am charged with Inconsistencies, in managing the Cause betwixt these two Extremes; and what can be more frightful than for a Man to fall foul of himself? But let us examine these Things a little:

1. *Say you*, p. 8. "When I am writing against the *Episcopalians*, I shew a warm Zeal for the Word

t you " Word of God, and the Apostolick Examples;
 to the " in Opposition to what crept in afterwards;
 have " but when I write against the Independents, I
 asserti- " allow Things necessary unto Decency and Or-
 effions " der, that do not appear in the first Formation
 ur Ob- " of Churches, namely Ecclesiastical Courts
 n, and " meeting in the Name of Christ, &c. These,
 us Per- " say y u, we have as little Scripture-Warrant for,
 truth in " as the *Episcopalians* have for their *Diocesan*, or
 brought " there is for an *universal Bishop*." For this ob-
 Explic, serve you cite, p. 213, 258, 260. But, might
 occasion you not have cited p. 10. p. 261. and then it
 im Po- would have appeared, that I sought no more of
 rtainty the *Episcopalians*, than I did of the *Independents*?
 ism and But more particularly, 1. You must once prove
 eral Li- that the raising of one Officer above Presbyters,
 a Ca- to be a Diocesan Bishop, is merely circumstantial;
 other and that Christ has left that Matter of his Rulers
 are Af- to be managed according to his general Rules of
 Book, Decency and Order, before your Parallel will run.
 ou tell This is all along denied, and that on good
 it was Grounds. Things Essential to Christ's House
 at Pres- by a positive, fixed Rule and Institution particu-
 endents, larly, is something different from what is purely
 a were circumstantial, as that of more or fewer Courts
 es this in any Church is. The common Wealth of
 n char- *Geneva* has but one Presbytery in the Church there-
 e Cause in, and no more is necessary in their present Si-
 can be tuation, and yet she is still owned to be Presbyte-
 of him- rian. 2. It is at the same Time false, that there
 a little: is neither Apostolical Example, nor Precept for
 against the Subordination of Judicatories. It was soon
 for the enough to have taken that for granted, when you
 Word had fully answered the Arguments I had brought
 for establishing the Contrary. 3. For the same
 Rea-

Reasons there cannot be an equal Apology for the Subordination of Church-Officers till they come to an universal *Bishop*, that there is for the Subordination of Courts till they come to a general *Council*, as you allow. In a Word, if the Proportion of your Parallel hath any Thing in it, it is this, *viz.* Because *Solomon* hath said, *In the Multitude of Counsellors there is Safety* ; therefore it is equally safe to descend from the Council of a great Multitude, and devolve all into one Person. 4. Your Assertion is naught, seeing I know no *Presbyterian* that ever maintained that the Church was one external, constant and actual Society. They hold it to be one habitually, having an inherent Power to assemble on proper Occasions. Do not they all hold, that the Government is exercised in particular Churches or Vicinities ; and at the same Time, that the whole Church, or some great Parts of it, have some common Interests that may require to be handled in Synods or Councils, by their combining or delegated Officers ? And however you may be angry with a Church's determining Circumstances as Time and Place, &c. yet the Necessity of this is owned by the Independents in *N. England*, their *Platform*, Ch. 1. § 4.

Your 2d Instance, p. 10. is, "That I am confident there is no Example of a Congregational Presbyterian in the N. Testament ; but that I doubt not that in the 2d and 3d Centuries, the most of the Christian Churches were congregational." But have you set down the different Pages whereon this Inconsistency is founded ? No, that would have at once spoiled all, and given every candid Reader to see, that I gave it as my Opinion, that, according to what I could learn from the History of

the N. Testament, I was not able to determine myself of any one Church that was no more but congregational, or that continued so; but in After-Ages I perceived from humane Testimony, that the most of the Churches mentioned by them were such, and in small Villages. The Reader may compare p. 211, 605. with p. 534, &c. and then judge for himself. But, have I any where said, that these Churches were Independent? No, the downright Contrary is evident, so far as humane Testimony can determine, p. 587, &c. And, for a further Confirmation of the same Thing, you may read *Cyprian's* 67th Epistle, and that of *Basil* to the *Neocæsarians*. In a Word, tho' I shewed what were the Methods used to raise the Episcopal Power in large Cities, where there were no Congregations than one, when the Altar was erected in the Bishop's Church, and so *one Priest and one Altar*, and *one Church and one Altar*, came to be current Terms; yet I never so much as insinuated, that this Practice, or these Terms were according to the New Testament. That they were borrowed from the Old Testament, I do not much question; and from thence came that received Maxim among many of the Antients, *A real Priesthood, and a real Sacrifice*. Thus I have got rid of this Inconsistency, and I wish it may not rise again on me in another Shape.

Alas! you have turn'd it into another Figure, to. and tell me, That "I make a Congregation, when disputing with you, an Assembly capable of being edified by one Pastor at a Time; but, against the Episcopalians, I make it to consist of a whole Body's partaking of one Altar." But, have you set down the Pages where this formidable

dable Inconsistency is founded? No, you set down p. 534, 535. for the one Branch, but the other must be sought out, p. 82. There it is that I say, A single Congregation is such a competent Number of Christians, as can assemble for ordinary in one Place for publick Worship, and may be edified by the Preaching of one Pastor at a Time. This Notion of a Congregation is almost the same in Words, with that of the Independents in *N. England, Platform*, Chap. 3. § 4. But as to my asserting the other Branch of the alledged Inconsistency, is notoriously false, and in express Words the Contrary is alledged, in the very Pages you refer unto, p. 534, 535. For in these I hold, that in large and populous Cities there were several Congregations in the first Ages of the Church. And tho' the Guise of these Times brought it in Custom, for gaining their End, to have all of them communicate at the Bishop's Church; yet it never entred into my Head, they were all one single Congregation on that Account, nor have I given the least Imputation of it. Candor with solemn Pretensions is very suitable.

You next fright me with a 4th Inconsistency p. *ibid.* and my Loss is, I can scarcely make Sense of your Words, so as to find out what you intend.

In the Entry you represent me as holding against the Independents, "That all these converted by
 " the Ministry of the Apostles in *Jerusalem*, and all
 " these converted by *Paul's* Ministry in *Ephesus*, &c.
 " made up so great a Number of Christians both
 " in *Jerusalem* and *Ephesus*, that there behoved
 " to be many Congregations in each of them."
 But here again you conceal the Pages in which
 your

your Remark is founded. But do I any where hold, that these who were of the Church of *Jerusalem* had no Residence in that City, or its Vicinities? No, the Contrary is expressly held by me, which you have overlooked, but taken the Freedom to misrepresent me, as if I had alledged, that all these converted in *Judea* and *Asia*, had been Members of the Churches of *Jerusalem* and *Ephesus*; and, lest the Fraud should have appeared to every ordinary Reader, you have concealed the Pages of my Book, to which I refer the Reader, p. 189, &c. and 413. But, what is the Amount of all this? Alas! he is inconsistent with himself; for I hold, say you, p. 425. "That the Church in the singular Number, so far as I can observe, is nowhere in the N. Testament made Use of, in express Terms, to denote any more than the Christians in some City, except when the Catholick Church is meant." These I own are my Words, and I still hold the same Opinion; But, where is the Inconsistency, when your former perverted Sense is removed? I hold that the Church of *Ephesus* imports only the Christians in that City or its Neighbourhood, and yet it must be taken distributively for several Congregations therein. I hold, against Dr. *Hammond*, that the Church of *Ephesus* cannot be taken distributively for all the Churches of *Asia*. Now the whole Secret is out.

But I am no sooner free of one Inconsistency, than I am charged with another, with equal Honesty and Fairness, p. 11. Here I am represented as inconsistent, because I say, p. 327. That a Court vested with a Power to give forth Laws and Regulations, must be impowered to censure the Contra-

veeners thereof ; But, where lies the Contradiction ? O yes, *You make such a Difference between the Exercise of the Key of Doctrine, and that of Discipline, as supposes a Power of giving forth the Laws of Jesus Christ, and yet not of censuring the Contraveeners.* Again, how does this appear ? “ One Pastor, say *you*, is allowed by me, to give forth the Laws of Christ doctrinally, but has not the Power of Jurisdiction and Government, or the Exercise of Discipline, p. 603.” Now, the whole Intreague is out, and a greater Perversion of Words is not conceivable than what is here. I hold, p. 603. *That a Power of Preaching and Administration of the Sacraments, is so conveyed to Pastors, as they can singly, and by themselves, dispense these to any competent Number of Christians ; yet the Power of the Keys, in the Matter of Discipline and Government, cannot be exercised but by a Plurality assembled together in Christ's Name.* And thus, they that have a dogmatical and jurisdictional Power to judge of false Doctrines, and give forth Laws and Regulations, have the Power of Censure, tho' one Pastor, who has a Power to preach and dispense the Sacraments, has not this but *in collegio* : Let the Reader compare p. 306, 307, 308, 310, 325, &c. and 262. and judge, whether your Conduct be consistent with common Justice. I made it my Care to distinguish between a doctrinal Power as exercised in preaching the Word to any competent Number of Christians, and a dogmatical Power, connected with that of Jurisdiction and Censure, and exercised in a Court of Christ, in condemning false Doctrines, giving forth Laws and Regulations, and censuring the Contraveeners ; whereas you represent me, as holding the Power of Preaching the Word, and

that

that of condemning false Doctrines in a Court of Christ, to be one and the same Thing.

I have got through all your Instances save one, p. 11. and wish I may get rid of it, for it is very formidable. For, *say you*, " I have maintained, " against the *Independents*, the Subordination of " the Synagogues unto superior Courts, and made " much Use of the Jewish Church, as the same " Thing essentially with the Christian ; but against " the *Episcopalians*, I affirm the Christian Church " was not founded till the Resurrection of Christ."

But, where are these Words to be read in my Book, or the Pages in which the Reader will find them ?

This was not expedient that the Reader should know, lest the Remark had been cast as unjust : For I hold,

p. 1. That properly the Christian Church was founded on the Resurrection of Christ, and had not a formal Being distinct from the Jewish till that Time ; yet the Gospel-church had its Beginnings in the Ministry of *John* the Baptist, and was gradually carried on by Christ and his Apostles, till its formal Establishment, distinct from the Jewish Polity.

Again, I hold that the Covenant of Grace under the Old Testament, and that under the New, were substantially the same, p. 120. Farther, That there was good Reason to infer a Subordination of Judicatories under the New Testament, from the Subordination of the Synagogues to the Ecclesiastical Sanhedrim under the Old ; and that this Argument was founded, not on the Identity of the Thing, but on a Parity of Reason, p. 283, &c.

Now, shew me the Inconsistency of these Propositions. But, alas ! I find another Thing subjoined, p. 12. namely, " That the Christian Churches were " formed according to the Synagogues, and yet I

“ would not suffer the Church in *Jerusalem* to be like a Synagogue. ” Yes, I will allow it to be so, as to the Order of its standing Officers, and some Usages ; but not as if it was a single Congregation : This is all, so far as I know, that ever was meant by the Christian Church’s taking its Model from the Synagogue, and not from the Temple; and so all the Testimonies adduced by me, do confirm.

Thus, Sir, I have got through your Instances on the Head of Inconsistency, and leave the Reader to judge, how consistent your Conduct is with the Solemnity of your Pretensions in the Conclusion.

I come next to your critical Examinations, p. 12, 13. And, 1. You spend a great deal of Time on a very trivial Point, which can neither affect the Cause the one Way nor the other. I desired you might assign any Place of the New Testament, that calls any single Church *the Church at Ephesus*, &c. p. 90. To this you answer, That it is so called, *Acts* 8. 1. and 13. 1, &c. but the Question is not yet answered : I desired, in your own Dialect, an express Scripture-Answer, without either adding or paring ; whereas in [these Texts you have left something out, which is in the Predications answerable to what went before in the Antecedent.

Your next Criticism is in p. 14. Where you tell me, “ I would puzzle you with an hard Question upon the famous Phrase, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ*, *Acts* 4. 25, “ 26.” The Question was, Where is it to be learned, that *Herod and Pontius Pilate, the Kings of the Earth, with the Rulers, assembled together in one Place against the Lord and his Christ?* The Copulative, *and*, has been misplaced, in putting it be-

fore

fore *the Kings of the Earth*. Now, I shall endeavour to fix it, that my Meaning and Question was just: And, 1. In the 25. and 26. *Verses*, is a Quotation from the second Psalm, and the particular and remarkable Application of it to Christ is the Thing in Question. The Apostles give us the clearest Exposition of the Words, as the Ground of the Application of them to Christ: Whom are we then to understand by the *Heathen* and the *People*, and by the *Kings of the Earth*, and the *Rulers*? In the Judgment of all the Apostles, they were *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate* that were assembled with the *Gentiles* and *People of Israel*, v. 27. *For of a Truth against thy holy Child Jesus — both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the People of Israel, were gathered together.* These Words make it plain whom we are to understand by the *Kings and Rulers*; and so they have left no Room for your Explication of them, viz. “That by the *Rulers* we are to understand the *Rulers of the Jews*, who were gathered together in one Place; and that *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate* were the *Kings* that stood up distinct from the *Rulers*.” But, are not all *Kings* *Rulers*, tho’ all *Rulers* are not *Kings*? And if so, they cannot be excluded here; nay, the Apostles expressly include them. Have they any where here, made a Distinction between the *Rulers* and the *Kings*, or insinuate that we are only to understand the *Jewish Rulers*? No, it is only the *People of Israel* who are charged. Our Lord was put to Death by the Authority of the *Roman Empire*, and executed by the *Roman Soldiers*, the *Gentiles*; and yet the Charge of his Death is on the *Jews*, upon the whole Nation, because done by their Instigation and Connivance,

Acts

Acts 2. 23. Thus, there was no Need to go to *Luke* 23. in order to find out the Application of these Words, contrary to the Mind of the whole Apostles, who have done it with more than ordinary Speciality.

But, lest you should charge me with perverting the Text, I shall shew you, that I am not alone in what I said. Dr. *Owen* in his second Volume on *Heb. exercit.* p. 47. has these Words on *Psalms* 2. 2. " In their Judgment [the Apostles] *Herod* and " *Pontius Pilate* with their Adherents, as exercising " supreme Rule and Power in and over the People, " with respect unto them on whom they depen- " ded, and whose Authority they exercised, name- " ly the *Romans*, the great Rulers of the World, " were the Kings and Rulers intended in this " Psalm. " He adds, " *Pilate* acted legal Power, " the Power of the supreme Magistrate among " them; and such are every where called Kings in " Scripture : Besides, he acted the Power of the " great Rulers of the World, who made Use of " Kings as the Instruments of their Rule ; so that " in and by him, the Power of the Gentile World " was acted against Christ. " Now, I put the Question again, namely, Whether *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, the Kings of the Earth, and the Rulers were gatherd together into one Place against the Lord and his Christ ? By your own Confession they did not ; nor did the People of *Israel* into *Pilate's* Judgment-hall, *John* 18. 28. They did indeed all assemble ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, in this holy City as some render it, by the Addition of the Greek σὺ : And so, according to this different Reading which you put me in Mind of, I infer, that those who made Use of it did not believe that ἐπὶ τὸ δῖον

was to be taken in a restricted Sense, confining them to one Place or House, but leaves it at large to their assembling in that City in different Places and distinct Assemblies; which plainly answers my Purpose. Thus, I am bound to you for your different Reading, tho' I had seen it before. You further tell me, That the Adverb $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota$, *Psal.* 2. 2. signifies *in one* : But then, its being made Use of to denote one Place or House in which Persons assembled, is not to be gathered from the Word itself, but from the Circumstances of the Text, where it is used : Thus *Arius Montanus* renders it by the *Latine* Adverb *pariter*, which hath different Significations ; and, as for the *Greek* Phrase answering to it, you own it signifies no more but *in the same* ; and so you have not yet discovered what Ground there is for taking it always to denote one local Place or House. If the Phrase itself does not signify so much, the Text and Context must determine us where it is used : The present Text determines the contrary, and *Pasor* gives the *Greek* Phrase various Significations, who is no mean Judge in that Language. See *Psal.* 133. 1. The *Septuagint* render $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota$, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, *Concord in Affection*.

But, 2. It must be further noted, that the *Greek* Word, αὐτὸς, is a relative Pronoun, and is the same with *ipse*, or *he* in our Language ; and when the Article ὁ, ἡ, τὸ, is put before it, then it is rendered by *idem*, the same, *Luke* 6. 33. τὸ αὐτὸ ποιεῖσιν : Here *πρᾶγμα*, *Negotium*, is to be understood, *They do the same Thing*. The same Phrase is rendered, *The same Mind towards one another*, *Rom.* 12. 16. and 15. 5. Again, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, sometimes signifies, *In the same Place*, and [then the Supplement may be

χώστον,

χῳρον, *locus*, Acts 1. 15. Sometimes it is used to signify the same Purpose, or with the same Design and then its Supplement may be *ἐλευμα*, *consilium* as it is, Acts 3. 1. and 4. 26. At other Times it is used to signify the same Work or Business, and then we may supply *πράγμα*, *negotium*, 1 Cor. 14. 23. Besides, it is sometimes used for an Adverb and then it signifies, *together*, *simul*, *una*, denoting the Conjunction or Concurring of the Persons spoken of, in the same Action, as Luke 17. 35. Now *ὁμοθυμαδον*, sometimes may bear the same Sense but its natural Signification is, to express the Unanimity of Persons in the same Work or Business without denoting their personally assembling together in one Place or House; as, Rom. 15. 6. Acts 2. 46. and 8. 6. The Samaritans are said with one Accord to give Heed to Philip, even from the least to the greatest, v. 10. But this cannot possibly denote they did this in one Place or House: Nay the same is the Sense of the Word, Acts 12. 2. For these of Tyre and Sidon cannot be imagined to come all personally to Herod at one and the same Time and Place; yet all the People in these, might concur in the same Work or Business, or be of the same Mind therein. The same I take to be the Sense of the Word, Acts 19. 29. Again, *ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ* Acts 2. 44. where it is said, All that believed were together, if it shall be taken to denote the same Place, yet it may justly be understood of Jerusalem; for they were not altogether in the same Spot or House in that City, seeing we find them v. 46. breaking Bread from House to House: Or it may also respect the same Work or Business, which they are said to be employed in, v. 42. Thus, in all these Significations, there is nothing can determine

used to them ; but the Circumstances of the Text where the Phrase is used.

As to *Acts* 4. 26. the *Septuagint* renders it the same Way, *Psal.* 22. as it is there ; and the *Hebrew* has it, יָחָד וְיִסְּדוּ, *consultant una*, and our Version, *The Rulers took Counsel together*. Now, *jachad*, the *Hebrew* Word, and the *Greek* Phrase, denote their Agreement and Concurrence in Counsel and Practice, and to one Design and Purpose ; and so *Aquila* the *Jew* expresseth it by *ἁποθυμαδόν*, as was observed to you formerly. Neither Word in the *Psalms* respects one Place, seeing the *Heathen* and *People of Israel*, and the *Kings of the Earth* and *Rulers*, were not met in one Place, tho' they frequently agree in one Mind and one Design, namely, to oppose *Christ*, and overturn his Kingdom in this World : For, granting the Prophecy is by the *Apostles* justly applied to the Opposition which *Christ* met with first, and then his immediate *Ambassadors* after his Resurrection, in the City of *Jerusalem*, yet it is not to be confined to that Time or Place, but understood of the Opposition to *Christ's Kingdom* in every Age, and every where on the Earth. Besides, those who were gathered at that Time, which gave Occasion to this remarkable and particular Application of the Prophecy, were only *Jews*, and these but a very few, being *Rulers* or *Members* of their Council; yet, even in this the Prophecy was verified, as it is in all the Opposition which *Christ's Kingdom* meets with at this Day : Mean while, the Page of my Book, on which this Remark is founded, is concealed, p. 216. Your next Criticism is, p. 16. Here you are raised into a Surprise, because I say, that " *They all,*

“ Acts 5. 12. cannot be constructed with the
 “ whole Church, or, as many as heard these Things,
 “ but with the Apostles, who are the immediate
 “ Antecedent. You further tell me, That you
 “ can see nothing unnatural in the Construction,
 “ and wonder at my Observation. ” But, that
 your Wonder may not continue, my Observation
 plainly was, p. 225. That, *they all*, having the
Apostles for its immediate Antecedent in the same
 Verse, it was unnatural to construe it with the
whole Church in a former Sentence, and according
 to the Judgment of our Translators in a former
 Paragraph; and so the Texts which you cite, viz.
Acts 6. 5. and 8. 1. *1 Thess.* 1. 1, 2. *2 Thess.* 1. 1,
 2, 3. are by no Means Parallels; for the collective
 Nouns there, are immediately joined with their
 Relatives, and there are none else in the Context.
 Besides, both Relatives and Antecedents are in the
 same Gender, which when it can be had, the con-
 trary is not readily to be embraced.

I find a Construction somewhat like unto yours
 pled for by the *Socinians*, when they must need
 have the relative Pronoun *they*, *Acts* 15. 11. to be
 constructed with the *Gentiles*, v. 7. But the accu-
 rate *Witsius* justly observes, that *they* ought to be
 constructed with the *Fathers* its immediate Antece-
 dent; and this, says he, the Strength of the Ar-
 gument, the Series of the Speech, and the gram-
 matical Construction do require, *they* being in the
 Masculine Gender, and the *Gentiles* in the Neuter.
OEconom. Fæd. L. 3. c. 2. p. *mihi* 208. Yet here
 both Nouns are in the same Paragraph with the
 Relative, which is not in your Case.

I must further observe, that you seem to let
 light of the Context, and say, “ Whatever be

“ said

" said in the Context, the Text only says, *The*
" People magnified them;" Which, according to
 you, were these who were with one Accord in
Solomon's Porch, viz. the Apostles and the Church.
 I'll readily grant you more than perhaps is desir'd,
 namely, that both the *Apostles, Church and Jews*
 were in *Solomon's Porch*; but that neither the
 Church, nor the unbelieving *Jews*, durst join them-
 selves in *Nearness* to the Apostles, on the Account
 of what was fallen out. How long this Fear
 continued, so as to keep them from joining in
 Nearness to them, is not determin'd; but that it
 produced good Effects, answerable to the Nature
 of just Fear, is evident. And tho' you say,
 " We are not so much acquainted with the Na-
 " ture of the Fear of the Twelve, as the Fear of
 " God, shewing himself awful in the Church;"
 yet there is no Inconsistency in their having a
 Fear of both. Thus, *1 Sam. 12. 18. All the*
People greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel. Here
 the same Verb, *jare*, to fear, expresseth both that
 religious Fear due unto God only, and that of Re-
 verence due to *Samuel*, as a Prophet, which is
 of a different Nature from the former. The
 like might be observed from *Prov. 24. 21. 1 Chron.*
29. 20. Thus my Criticism holds good for ought
 you have advanced; and as for what I have
 said further on this Head, it is wholly overlookt
 by you; and the Page on which your Remark is
 founded is concealed here, as well as in the for-
 mer, *viz. p. 225, 226.* For the Fear spoken of, as
 to the Apostles; see *p. 30.* of my Book.

You next fall hard on me, *p. 17, 18.* for my
 saying, *p. 241.* That it was a begging of the
 Question to alledge that there was a Feast at Je-

Jerusalem when *Paul* went up, *Acts* 21. Here you mark
 the Page when you thought your Adversary was in
 your Mercy ; and tell me, you have some Hopes to
 satisfy me that you did not beg it. But how is this
 done ? Say you, *Acts* 20. 16. *Paul* hastened, if it was pos-
 sible, to be at *Jerusalem* against the Day of *Pentecost*.
 What is the Consequence ? Therefore he was actu-
 ally at *Jerusalem* at the Day of *Pentecost*. The Con-
 sequence is refused ; how is it proved ? The *Jews*
 say you, which were of *Asia* stirred up all the
 People, and laid Hands on him, *Acts* 21. 27. Now
 the Consequence is again refused, therefore these
Jews were at *Jerusalem* on the Account of *Pentecost*.
 The *Jews* in *Asia* had other Occasions of being
 there besides the Day of *Pentecost*, or on the Ac-
 count of publick Feasts ; and the Apostle was
 sometimes late, and hindered from the Accomplish-
 ment of his Purposes. Besides, 1. *Paul* came to
Jerusalem, and the Day following went in unto
James, *Acts* 21. 18. The next Day thereafter he
 purified himself with the four Men which had
 Vow ; and this was the same on which he was ap-
 prehended, being the second free Day after he
 came unto *Jerusalem*. Thus, by comparing *Acts*
 22. 30. & 23. 12, 31. with *Acts* 24. 1, 11. the
 Day on which *Paul* was arraigned before *Festus* at
Cæsaria, was the twelfth Day current ; so that he
 had not two free Days at *Jerusalem*. Thus, by a
 the Circumstances I can perceive in this History,
 cannot see the least solid Ground to determine me
 that the Feast of *Pentecost* was during the Time
Paul was at *Jerusalem*. There is not the least
 Hint of it, when the inspired Historian is narrating
 the Ground and Reason wherefore it was expedient

the A
 The A
 witho
 count
 was t
 tors,
 that r
 Acts
 Book.
 and f
 had
 they
 conve
 for hi
 Ag
 an Ev
 9. 31
 Chris
 pear
 The C
 Rest a
 Churc
 consec
 plicat
 than
 and,
 I am
 24. f
 Churc
 Chnr
 all gr
 also ?
 fer, t
 under
 the Acts

the Apostle should purify himself. He only saith, *The Multitude, or Mob, must needs come together,* without insinuating they were there on the Account of *Pentecost*. 2. It doth not appear, that it was the believing *Jews* that were *Paul's* Persecutors, tho' it was chiefly to remove their Offence, that made him purify himself, as is plain from *Acts* 21. 19, 20. and what I have said, p. 34. of my Book. Thus, these of *Asia* that were in *Jerusalem*, and stirred up the People, were probably such as had dogged after *Paul* in his Journey, thinking they might have Opportunity against him more conveniently there. Thus the Reader must judge for himself.

Again, p. 18. you cite p. 188 of my Book, as an Evidence of my Partiality in quoting *Acts* 9. 31. as an Argument of the Multiplication of Christians in *Jerusalem*. But how does this appear? O yes, very clearly; for it is there said, *The Churches throughout all Judea and Samaria, had Rest and were multiplied.* But, Sir, was not the Church of *Jerusalem* one of these in *Judea*, and consequently had her large Share in these Multiplications, by how much this City was larger than others therein? This is all that was intended, and, I humbly conceive, made good. But alas! I am found Fault with again for citing *Acts* 12. 24. for an Argument of the Multiplication of the Church of *Jerusalem*, because there were other Churches to be increased besides this. This is all granted; but, had not *Jerusalem* her Share here also? But, Sir, on this very Quarrel of yours, I infer, that the Church in the singular Number contains under it many single Churches; for it is said, *Acts* 12. 1. *Herod stretched forth his Hands to vex*

certain of the Church. This I hope was not only the Church of *Jerusalem*, nor the Church as invisible. *Quo minime credas gurgite piscis erit.*

Again, I am quarrelled about the Myriads, *Acts* 21. 20. as if I would have my Reader imagine, " That these Myriads spoken of, are the " same Thing with the Multitude that would be " informed of *Paul's* coming to the City ; and " so there were no more believing *Jews* than " what could hear of his Coming, and come together on that." This is your Meaning, so far as I can take it ; and the Reader may consult p. 240, 241. and see how it is founded. Might not all these, and even the unbelieving *Jews*, come together in the Temple, tho' they could not hear *Paul's* Voice speaking, or assemble as one regular Congregation ? Such a Way of doing is mean, and unbecoming a Man to misrepresent and trifle. I shall only add here, That the Myriads spoken of were all Members of the Church of *Jerusalem*, seems still more probable to me ; 1. Because they were not such as could bear any Witness against *Paul*, but by Hearsay, *They are informed of thee*, *Acts* 21. 21. Now the *Jews* which were of *Asia*, or among the Gentiles, had seen and heard *Paul*, and could testify concerning him of their own Knowledge, and would not be blinded by his present Conformity and Shew of Regard to the Law. 2. It is plain, these only of *Jerusalem* could receive Satisfaction by *Paul's* Conformity to the Law at that Time, and not others.

Your next Observe is, p. 19, 20. And here again you have not amind the Reader shall have easy Access to the Pages of my Book whereon it is founded. Therefore he may read from p. 230

to 238
dipt i
and on
alread
refer
about
as also
how r
if you
which
refer
terians
I recr
with i
You
son wh
" a C
" twel
for I fa
to leav
Pastors
and Ti
tures, t
being
Practic
ly, tha
he lets
tures w
Elders
when t
before
the sec
says th
Titus v
were v

to 238. and judge whether you have so much as dipt into the Argument. As to your *one Church and one Altar*, or *one Priest and one Altar*, I have already spoken to it. All I shall now add, is to refer the Reader to p. 463. and *Appendix p. 21.* about the Sentiment of the honourable Lord King; as also to p. 520, 534, 579, & 580. and then judge how much Antiquity favours Independency; or if you have so much as touched on these Points, which you was bound to have done, when you refer to that Authority. You charge the Presbyterians with positive Affertions; but justly might I recriminate in every *Page* almost, when all I meet with is nothing else but such.

You next put me to it, p. 20. to give my Reason wherefore I said, p. 418. "That *Paul* planted a Church at *Ephesus*, before he met with the twelve Disciples." But my Reason follows; for I said, *It was not his usual Practice in other Cities*, to leave them whom they had profelyted, without Pastors. Nor is my so saying contrary to *Acts 14.* and *Tit. 1. 5.* as you alledge. For, 1. These Scriptures, tho' they bore all you intended, are so far from being Proofs that it was not *Paul's* ordinary Practice, that they declare the contrary; namely, that wherein it was not his general Practice, he lets us know the Exceptions. 2. These Scriptures will never be a Proof that there were no Elders ordained in *Crete* by *Paul* and *Titus* when together in that Place, or in every Church, before *Paul* and *Barnabas* returned through them the second Time. As for *Crete*, in which *Virgil* says there were an hundred Cities, 'tis manifest *Titus* was left there to set in Order Things that were wanting or undone, which intimates he was
to

to compleat a Work already begun. Besides, if *Titus* was left at *Crete* to ordain Elders, and there were none there before, then he was to ordain them singly by himself; but you will first give an Instance in the New Testament, that a single Person did ordain, and then reconcile such a Practice with *Mat.* 18. 20. 3. As to *Iconium*, *Lystra* and *Antioch*, unto which *Paul* and *Barnabas* returned, *Acts* 14. it is plain they were under severe Persecution, on their first going through these; and so, if they did not ordain Elders, it doth not appear to be through Choice, but through Necessity; whereas, on his first Coming to *Ephesus*, we find they were most earnest for his longer Continuance with them, *Acts* 18. 19. This is all I find you have against what I have said about the Church of *Ephesus*, and a very pitiful Point it is you have quarrelled, and what little or nothing affects my Argument, p. 412. to p. 423.

You next fall hard on me, p. 20, 21. about the Word *Brethren*, and say, "I pervert *Mat.* 23. 8. "when I take the Name there to denote Brethren "in Office." But, if it would not put you in Passion, I would tell you, that both *Pareus* and *Piscator* take it in the same Sense, and give solid Reasons for their so doing. But, have you marked down the Pages of my Book on which this Observe is founded? No, this would have given the Reader easy Access to see your Trifling. I have proved by clear Scripture-arguments, that *Brother* and *Brethren* are frequently made Use of as Names denoting Persons in Office, p. 295. And, as I never intended to prove that this Name was nowhere made Use of in the New Testament, but to denote Persons in Office; so there was no Need

for

for my so doing. Had you but attempted to give any suitable Reason against what I have said, p. 294, 473, 386. about the Use of this Name in Scripture, you might have had more Ground to quarrel me on this Head. Nor will it be of any Consequence what you add, p. 22. viz. That *the Saints or private Believers, as distinguished from the Elders, are called Brethren*. What then? Are the Grounds on which private Christians are distinguished from the Elders the same, on account of which the Elders are distinguished from the Church? That both agree in this Name, on account of their common Faith and Profession, none will refuse; But still it is alledged, that this Name includes more in it, when it distinguisheth the Elders from the Church. But, *say you*, p. 23. *they can never be distinguished by a Word common to them both*. But, if this proves any Thing, it proves too much. The Name of *Apostle* is a Word that signifies a common Messenger; and consequently must not be applied peculiarly to the immediate Ambassadors of Christ. The Name *Deacon* is made Use of to denote a Servant at large; and *Presbyter*, a Man of Age or Experience, and at other Times the Antients; and consequently these cannot be Words peculiarly denoting Persons in Office. But you add, "If I had well consider'd the Texts noted down by me, I would have found other Designations added to distinguish Officers from other Brethren out of Office." But, 1. Have you pointed forth what these were in the several Texts mentioned by me? No. 2. The Brethren, in the 15th of the *Acts*, have such Work ascribed to them, and are joined with others in jurisdictional Acts, which in very clear

E
Terms

Terms discover they were Brethren in Office; and on this Foundation I have called them so. Thus your mentioning 2 Cor. 10. 13. Eph. 6. 21. Phil. 2. 25. Texts cited by me for a Discovery of what you have said above, strongly pleads for me, and says, That these Persons were called Brethren, on such Grounds as were not common between them and private Christians. And so I am obliged to you.

But, before I leave this Head, I have a strong Imagination that the Name *Brethren* is taken in the Sense I have been pleading for, Acts 15. 7. *Men, Brethren, ye know how that a good While ago God made Choice among us, that the Gentiles by my Mouth should hear the Word of the Gospel.* Sir, was the Choice made among *us* private Persons? *Peter* was himself a Person in Office, and this Choice was made out of the Multitude to which he addressed himself: But if the Choice was made out of this Multitude, then these, out of which the Choice was made, must be supposed to be in Office, or in some Measure qualified with him for that Office of preaching to the Gentiles. In the same Sense the Words *Men, Brethren* must be taken, v. 13. as denoting such as were *Brethren* in a peculiar Manner. Besides, this I conceive to be the Meaning of the Word, Acts 21. 17. *The Brethren received us gladly.* Here there is no distinguishing Character annexed, except what is to be gathered from the Context, which you are pleased sometimes to let light of, as p. 17. But when we consider that the private Christians were stumbled at *Paul*; and, in order to appease them, he was advised to purify himself; it is not easy to believe that it was these that received him gladly.

gladly. Thus I take them to be the same with the Elders that were present with *James* in giving him the Advice, *v.* 18.

You next tell me, *p.* 23. That you are astonished at an Assertion of mine, concerning *Judas* and *Silas*, *p.* 313. Here you marked the Page, when you expected some Advantage. Out of the Midst of my Argument you have drawn a Sentence, which I frankly acknowledge was not accurately expressed by me ; *errare possim*, and upon a Review of it, I find it ought to have run thus, *Yet Judas and Silas were no more Members of the Church of Jerusalem, than Prophets at Antioch, tho' sometime Members there.* The plain Force of the Argument is, That in *Jerusalem* was the first Christian Church, and from thence extraordinary Officers came, or were sent by the Apostles, to assist in planting and watering the other Churches in the World. As an Evidence of this, I cited *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. Not that *Judas* and *Silas* are mentioned there, but that in the Church at *Antioch* there were Prophets, extraordinary Officers not fixed to any particular Church, and from among whom *Barnabas* and *Saul* were, by Command of the Holy Ghost, sent forth to publish the Gospel in other Nations. And I cited *Acts* 15. 32, 35. to shew, that *Judas* and *Silas* were Prophets, and so extraordinary Officers, as well as *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Now *Judas* and *Silas* are expressly called Prophets, *Acts* 15. 32. and consequently were of an extraordinary Character, *Eph.* 4. 11. Thus they had not any fixed Relation to *Jerusalem* more than to *Antioch*, or any other Church unto which they might be sent, or have a Call for a Time. And you seem yourself to have perceived the

Force of the Argument, when you add, " That
 " I infer from *Judas* and *Silas* their being Pro-
 " phets, that they were certainly Church-officers."
 To which you answer, That " by the same Rule,
 " I ought to believe that the Disciples, *Acts* 21.
 " 4. and *Philip's* four Daughters, v. 9. were
 " Church-officers." But, Sir, that they were
 Prophets, is expressly declared, *Acts* 15. 32. and
 consequently Church-officers of an extraordinary
 Character, as I have made evident, p. 35, &c.
 And when you shall make it appear, that these
 Disciples and Virgins were called by that Name,
 I shall freely own them to be extraordinary Of-
 ficers, without any Hurt to our Cause.

You next tell me, p. 23, 24. " That I have a
 " rare Criticism on *Acts* 16. 4. and an Inference
 " upon it, which might well have been spared, if
 " I had look'd back to the second Verse, and
 " that would have saved me looking as far down
 " as the *Revelation* for the Support of that Fan-
 " cy." But what second Verse do you mean?
 The second Verse of the 16th Chapter is nowise
 to the Purpose. Nay, in what Page of my Book
 is this Fancy laid down? This was not consistent
 with the Nature of your Observes, to tell us. If
 you mean *Acts* 15. 2. then the Words are, *Paul*
and Barnabas, and certain others, went up to the
Apostles and Elders about this Question. Now, does
 this prove that these were the Apostles and El-
 ders of the Church of *Jerusalem*? That it was the
 Apostles and Elders at that Time at *Jerusalem*, is
 plain; but that these all had a fixed Relation to
 that Church, either Apostles or Elders, is not said.
 This much I told you, p. 312, 313. and desired

you

That you might shew me where there is a Scripture, saying, *The Apostles and Elders of the Congregation of Jerusalem*, p. 319. which you have not seen meet to give any Answer to. You say, "I have looked as far down as the *Revelation* for the Support of my Fancy;" You might have said also as far up as *Acts* 20. 17. In a Word, tho' you tell me, "It would be endless to trace my Extravagancies on the 15th of *Acts*;" yet I shall give you a Reason for my distinguishing between *at* and *of*; and I imagine the Scriptures I have alledged will bear me out in it: I conceive, that *the Elders of the Church*, imports the peculiar Relation that is between that Church and them; whereas the Elders *at* Jerusalem, carries no more in it than the bare Indication of the Place where they were at the Time, without the least Hint of any stated Relation they bore unto that Church. So we find the Relation between the seven Angels and the seven Churches respectively express'd by *of*, and the Church or Candlestick is called *his*, *thy* *Candlestick*, Rev. 2. Thus *the Elders of the Church*, *Acts* 20. 17. expresseth the Relation between these Elders and the Church of *Ephesus*; whereas, had it been said, the Elders *at* the Church, no more could have been concluded than the bare Indication of the Place where they were at the Time. Thus I have given you the Reasons of my Fancy.

You come next to the Texts which I have adduced for proving a Catholick Church visible, p. 24. and in my Book, p. 51. here you hold, "The Disciples of Christ throughout the World, are no otherwise called a Church, than in so far as in the Judgment of Charity they may reckon"

"reckoned to be of the general Assembly of the First
 "born." Before I come to vindicate the Meaning
 of the several Texts mentioned by me, I shall
 lay down these Particulars, 1. There is a twofold
 Vocation or Calling spoken of in Scripture ; the
 one is merely external by the Word, *Mat. 20. 1.*
 the other internal and invisible by the Divine
 Spirit, *Rom. 8. 30.* 2. Agreeable to this, there
 is a twofold Faith ; the one common, which is
 to be found even in the Reprobate, *Acts 8. 13. Mat.*
13. 20. the other saving, and only in the Elec
 t, *Tit. 1. 1. Gal. 5. 6.* 3. There is also a twofold
 Sanctity or Holiness ; the one external and feder
 al, *Ezra 9. 2. Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* the
 other internal and absolute, which is only to be
 found in the Regenerate, *Psal. 93. 5.* 4. Answer
 able to these, there is a twofold Communion
 allowed to such as are within the Bond of the Co
 venant ; the one merely in its external Privileges
 and the other in these which are saving also. To
 the first, Infants born of Christian Parents have
 a Right, *Gen. 17. 7. Acts 2. 39.* and Persons at
 an adult Age, by their Profession of the Christian
 Faith, tho' in the Event it prove false and unfin
 cere, as was that of *Simon Magus* ; Yet these are
 some Way said to be ingrafted into Christ, tho'
 they do not abide in him, nor bring forth Fruit,
John 15. 2, 6. But the other have a saving Right
 from God, and Communion with the spiritual
 Blessings of the Covenant, *Heb. 8. 10.* To this
 Distinction belongs that of Circumcision outwardly
 and in the Flesh, and that inwardly in the Heart
 by the Spirit, *Rom. 2. 28, 29.* which by way of Analogy
 belongs to the Christian Church, and is applicable
 unto Baptism. 5. From all these Considerations

rations
 of the
 visible,
 Christi
 Worshi
 cal, wh
 and is c
 eth by
 us by t
 out from
 us, th
 who p
 ctrine :
 belong
 a true l
 ding to
 Effectua
 9. and
 Christ.
 in to b
 fings of
 who h
 own m
 to the
 is only
 so far a
 not so
 tive De
 Counte
 to his
 as visib
 Hav
 Vindic
 import
 is, 1 C

rations, there ariseth also a twofold Face or Form of the Church of Christ here on Earth ; the one visible, which consists in an open Profession of the Christian Faith, and Practice of the Duties of Worship ; the other spiritual, invisible and mystical, which owes its Origine to the Divine Election, and is consummate in a lively Faith, which worketh by Love. This Distinction is pointed out to us by the Apostle *John*, 1 *John* 2. 19. *They went out from us, but were not of us. They went out from us*, that is, from the visible Assembly of those who professed Christianity, and the Gospel-doctrine : *But they were not of us*, that is, they did not belong to the Society of the Elect, or such as had a true Faith among them in the Church. According to this View of Christ's House, the Elect, and Effectually called, are its only Members, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. and its Government solely belongs to God in Christ. As it is by him alone, they are received in to be Partakers of the spiritual and saving Blessings of the Redeemer's Purchase ; so it is he, who has Power and Right in the Hearts of his own mystical Members : And, tho' it be agreeable to the Nature of this secret State of Man, which is only certainly known to God, to discover itself so far as to give a credible Ground of Charity ; yet not so as if it could be discovered in all, by positive Determination, to be really different from its Counterfeits. Thus, when Christ gave Officers to his Church, it was not to her as invisible, but as visible.

Having laid down these Things, I come to the Vindication of the Texts attack'd by you, as not importing a visible, but invisible Church : The first is, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. which I connected with 1 *Cor.* 12. 28.

28. The Reason of my joining these two Scriptures together, was, that I found the Epistle indited not only to the *Corinthians*, but unto *all that in every Place call upon the Name of Jesus Christ*; and so the Apostle laid down a Foundation in the very Entry, to treat, not only of that Church in particular, but of the Church in her largest Extent, which he does in the 12. *Chap.* of that Epistle, and other Places therein. Now, passing your angry Words and Invectives, I observe, that, p. 25, you say, "It is the Body mystical, visibly or outwardly represented in the Church at *Corinth.*" But here we come to differ. If it be the Body mystical that is meant, it must be Christ's invisible Body, for I take these two to be the same. And then I add further, that the Church meant in the 12. *Chap.* is the Body political, and that of the whole Catholick Church; for Christ is the Head by his special Guidance and Means, and the Dispensation of Ordinances, no less than mystical by his spiritual Influences. That it is not meant of the invisible or mystical Body of Christ, is evident, in that there were Apostles, Prophets and Teachers set in this Church; and for the same Reason 'tis not the single Church of *Corinth.* That which is invisible, cannot under that Notion have a visible Ministry set into it, nor the several other Particulars I have mentioned, p. 348, &c, to which you have not given the least Answer. Besides, the Apostles which were set in this Church, were Catholick Officers, and had not their Relation restricted to any particular Church, having the whole World for their Charge. That these and the other Officers mentioned were set in this Church, intentionally for building up the mystical and invisible Body

Body
Time
Chur
they
of th
Mat.
Perve
fession
Broth
p. 15
"stil
"vis
"by
"he
"visi
"wh
"cau
"cers
"me
shall o
mystic
ciples
unless
is plai
mystic
ever a
intitle
sble;
can int
Body
spect to
bers of
ceive i
constit
Judgme

Body of the Redeemer, is owned; but at the same Time they were set in the visible Church, or the Church as visible. This is further evident, in that they themselves were visible Messengers, and some of them no more but only visible, *Acts* 1. 17. *Mat.* 7. 22. 23. But lest you should reckon me a Perverter of Scripture, I incline to take the Confession of an Adversary, a learned Independent Brother, namely Mr. *Hooker* in his *Survey*, Par. 1. p. 15. "The visible Church, saith he, is truly styled and judged by Scripture-Light to be the visible Body of Christ, over whom he is a Head by particular Government and Guidance, which he lends thereto, *1 Cor.* 12. 12. And that it is a visible Politick Body, appears quite through the whole Chapter, but especially, *v.* 27. 28. because in that Church God set Orders and Officers, some Apostles, Teachers, Helps, Governments; the like to this is, *Eph.* 4. 12, 13." I shall only add, if you take the Church here for the mystical Body of Christ; how then will your Disciples in the Judgment of Charity agree with it, unless you conclude them all to be real Saints? It is plain that none but such, are Members of the mystical Body of the Redeemer. Therefore, however a charitable Construction of a Person, may intitle him to be a Member of the Church as visible; yet nothing but real Grace in the Heart, can intile one, or constitute him a Member of the Body mystical or spiritual: So, Sir, in all due respect to you, while you talk of Persons being Members of the mystical Body of Christ, I humbly conceive it is only the hidden Man in the Heart, that constitutes a Person in that Relation, and your Judgment of Charity can neither add nor pare in

F

that

that Point. Yet on this Supposition your whole Harangues run, so far as I am able to take them.

Your next Exception, p. 26. is against *Eph. 3. 10.* its being meant of the Catholick Church visible: All you tell me on this Text is, "That you do not understand how it came into my Head, to take this Text for the visible Body of Christ, distinguished from the invisible, and from a particular Church." But, 1. If you mean, how I understand it of a Church *merely visible*; then I tell you, I understand no such Thing; for, tho' I understand of the Church as visible, yet, at the same Time as including many visible Saints, or even the mystical Body of Christ tho not as invisible, nor consisting of these only. 2. It is the Catholick Church visible, it being that in which *Paul* was made a Minister, *v. 7.* He was not made a Minister of one particular Congregation, nor of a Church as invisible, as was observed in the Entry. It was the Church organical *Paul* being a Ministers in it, and he being visible the Church in which he was set must be such unless we can suppose, that the Nature of that which is invisible, and under an invisible and spiritual Influence, is made up of that which is visible, or organized under that Notion, with visible Officers. This I take to be absurd, and therefore it was the same Body the Church of which *Paul* was made a Minister, *Col. 1. 24, 25.* and for which he underwent visible Sufferings: Thus then I take the Church here to be the catholick politick Body of the Redeemer, consisting of both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to which the external Dispensation of the Mysteries of the Gospel was made, that had been kept secret since the World began, *v. 4, 5. 1. Cor. 2. 9. Mat. 11. 11.* These were not made known

to

to the *Jews* only, nor to the *Gentiles* exclusive on them, but unto both, in the Fulness of Time. If a Word, to this Church, and not to every particular Congregation, did Christ give the Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists, *Eph.* 4. 11, 12.

You next come to *1 Cor.* 10. 32. p. 27. I have as little of a Proof that the Church here is meant of the mystical Body of Christ, as on the former Text ; therefore I take the Church here for the Body catholick visible : For either we must take the Words to include all the believing *Jews* and *Gentiles* making up one Church ; or take the *Jews* and *Gentiles* under the Notion of *Unbelievers*, and in Opposition to the Church ; and so upon either of these Senses, our Argument will conclude, tho' I rather incline the latter. The Precepts are negative and indefinite ; and so as they are general for the Time, and binding, both *semper* and *ad semper* ; so they must at the same Time respect all Places and Persons. In these traveling Times, some might give Offence in one Place, and some in another, and one in many Places. The whole Body was liable to Offence, tho' it was not by one Man ; and so the Object is set down indefinitely, thereby to comprehend the whole. Besides, Sir, I own I do not understand only the Church of *Corinth*, because there are many Things in the Epistle which cannot be restricted unto it. For, as the negative Precepts cannot be restricted to it ; so these are given to the Church as visible, and it is only the visible Church was capable of Offence, and to receive Satisfaction. In a Word, when the Apostle saith, *1 Cor.* 5. 12. *What have I to do to judge them that are without ?* Is this only these who were not of the Church of *Corinth* ?

If it be meant of these only who were without that Church, then *Paul*, whose Commission was universal, had nothing to do in judging those that were not of that Church. This shews that the Apostle speaks many Things in this Epistle that have a Reference to the Catholick Church visible and so in the present, he might be understood as having nothing to do in judging those that were without the visible universal Body of Christ.

You next come to *Heb. 2. 12. p. 27.* and argue as closely here as on the foregoing Text ; and tell me, “ You always took it for the General Assembly of the First-born, consisting of Christ’s Brethren.” That Christ’s Brethren were in this Church, I do not question, nor that it was to these he design’d to make known his Father’s Name savingly : But what I maintain is, That Christ’s declaring his Father’s Name, his Nature Attributes and Will, in order to the Salvation of Sinners, was to his Church as Visible, in which there were many who could not otherwise be called *Brethren*, than by mere Profession. To a Church as Visible, he declared himself during his personal Ministry, and thereafter by his Apostles he spread the Knowledge of God in the World, and gave a compleat Revelation of his Mind, which was to continue from Generation to Generation, to the End of Time. This Church is not to be understood of a single Congregation, seeing the external Declaration of God’s Name, was made by the Apostles to all the World ; and so the Church spoken of must be understood in that extensive Meaning. In a Word, *Psal. 22. 22. &c.* to which this Text does refer, contains a Prophecy of the Visibility of the Catholick Church under

under the New Testament. The like Prophecy we have, *Psal.* 2. and *Psal.* 72. 8, 9, 10, 11. and 86. 9. *Iſa.* 2. 2, 3, 4. *Zech.* 14. 9.

Laſtly, You come to 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. p. 27. And here you take it for granted, that the Church is the little Habitation of God at Ephesus. But here

1. The Church muſt be Viſible, becauſe *Timothy* and others were exiſting viſibly therein, and were to converſe together, and diſcharge their mutual Duties to one another ; the Epiſtle being written, that he might know how to behave himſelf in the Houſe of God.
2. It muſt be an organized Church, ſeeing the Epiſtle and the very Context contains Directions about Biſhops and Deacons.
3. It was not the Church of *Ephesus*, or any particular one, ſeeing the Epiſtle was written to *Timothy*, who was an Evangeliſt, and had not a fixed Reſidence in any particular Church ; and hereby he was directed how to behave himſelf in the Houſe or Church of God at large, wherever he ſhould be. His Office was to travel from Place to Place, and be inſtrumental in planting and watering the Church of God throughout the World, under the Direction of the Apoſtles.
4. When you alledge, that this was only the Church of *Ephesus*, it was ſuitable to an Answerer, to have diſcuſſed the Arguments I have alledged againſt it, p. 435. &c. and ſhewn, that this Church in which *Timothy* was to behave himſelf aright, was the myſtical or inviſible Church as ſuch.
5. You inſinuate, p. 28. that I ſay, p. 158, 159. " That the Elders of *Ephesus* were bound to feed the Church, which was by no means to be underſtood to be the Church as Viſible, but only thoſe who are truly redeemed, or the inviſible Body of Chriſt." Now, a groſſer Miſtake of

of Words and their Scope cannot be; for even in these very Passages, I held the Church in which the Elders were set, to be Visible, tho' every Thing there be not spoken of it as Visible, as the candid Reader of the Place will clearly perceive. Thus, Sir, I have taken the Affirmative, and given plain Reasons wherefore the several Texts mentioned by me, are to be understood of the Catholic Church visible; and I could give several others besides, and have justly alledged, *Eph. 11, 12. Rom. 12. 4, 10. p. 104, 105.* And tho' I own still, that the Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists and Pastors, were given intentionally to feed the mystical and invisible Body of Christ; yet still they were set in the Church as Visible, under which View of it, there is a Mixture both of good and bad.

You tell me, p. 28. That after I have cited the Scriptures, "I say, That the Children of professing Christian Parents, are to be reputed Members of the Visible Church." So I do. But what then? O, say you, "I would ask you, Why are they not to be reputed Members of the mystical Body, if one of the Parents be to be so reputed." To this I Answer, That it is neither the Reputation which you or any Man on Earth can have of them, which constitutes them Members of the mystical Body, but the secret Workings of the Spirit of Christ in the Heart, of which God himself is the alone Judge. A charitable Construction may serve to the admitting one a Member of the visible Church, but has no Concern in their Admission to the mystical Body of Christ. 2. The Children of professing Christian Parents, whether Believers

Believers or Unbelievers, are to be baptized. For, if the Children of the circumcised *Jews* were to be circumcised, because God said, *I will be your God, and the God of your Seed*; then, because the Promise is made to Christians, and their Seed in the New Testament, they are no less to be baptized, *Acts* 2. 38, 39. Thus, as they who are externally in Covenant under the Old Testament Dispensation, had their Children circumcised; so these who are only externally in the Christian Church, are to have their Children baptized. For Confirmation of this, compare *Gen.* 17. 7, 8. and 8. 3. with *Josh.* 5. 2, 3, 7. and with what is said and laid down, p. 108, 118. of my Book, where it will appear, that the Covenant of Grace and its Seals, were in Substance the same with these under the New, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 11. *1 Pet.* 3. 21, 22. 3. From all which I infer further, That because the visible Seal of the Covenant, by which Persons are solemnly initiate and inrolled, is a Thing catholick and œconomical, therefore these who are made Partakers thereof, have their Freedom to that whole Corporation or Kingdom, and have at least a Right to all the external Immunities and common Privileges thereof. Thus, as the Patent for Baptism is general, *Mat.* 28. 19. so they who are baptized in any true Church, are to be accounted visible Members of Christ's Kingdom throughout the Christian World. You add, p. 29. "And, tho' you may have a general Notion of all the Professors of the Name of Christ on the Earth, and express this your Notion by the Name *Church*; yet I desire you may shew me where, but in your own Head, all these Professors are united together

“ther in the Unity of one Ecclesiastical Government?” To this I answer, 1. I refer you to what I have said, *Chap. 2. § 8.* which is yet untouched by you. 2. Have either I, or any Presbyterian, asserted, that the Church catholick visible, is one external, stated and actual Society? It is sufficient if it be one habitually, as is observed already. 3. I call that visible which may be seen, tho’ it cannot be seen actually, and at one View: Therefore, when it is said that the whole World is visible, in order thereto an Act of the Understanding is required. We can convince all the Countries in the terraqueous Globe are visible no less than our own; and if we were there, each of them would be visible. Thus, tho’ we cannot actually, and at one View see all the Members of the catholick Church; yet this will never be a good Argument they are invisible. But I conceive you mean an universal *Idea* or *Genus*, which has no other Existence but in your own Brain. And so, 1. Can an universal *Idea* have Officers given unto it, seeing it is no more but an abstract Notion in a Man’s Head? Were the Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists given to that which had no Existence in Nature, except in a Man’s Mind? I always thought that a Political Body had been something real, and actually existing in the World. 2. Has an universal *Idea* any actual Existence of its own? The Catholick Church visible has a real Existence in Nature, by Combination and Aggregation; whereas an universal Notion is incapable of this, seeing it is only an Accident competent to an integral Body. 3. Has an universal *Idea* any Members, or an external State? The several single Churches in the World

World
lar Cl
result
and p
Pag
“scat
“&c
“Eld
“one
“Th
“the
“to
But, S
related
your
these
ministe
Church
very T
ness.
Answer
Questio
“was
“for
“bein
“men
“Pow
you ha
jumble
go to p
negativ
“be n
“ase
“c.
indefin

World, constitute one integral; and the particular Churches are integrant to the whole which results out of them. This I have spoke to, p. 263. and p. 348, &c.

Page 32. You say, "That I alledge the Churches scattered through *Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia,* &c. are expressly called the *Flock of God*, and the Elders are conjunctly called to feed or rule this one Flock which was among them." You add, "That it would have been fair to have told out the rest, and said that the Elders are required to feed the Flock which is among them, &c." But, Sir, 1. It would have been fair in you to have related my Mind fully on that Head, and told your Reader, That I expressly declared, That these Elders no doubt were particularly to administer Word and Sacraments to these distinct Churches separately, which is founded on that very Thing for which you challenge my Unfairness. 2. It would have been fair in you, as an Answerer, to have given a plain Reply to the Question after-stated, viz. "Whether this Flock was one, because they assembled in one Place for publick Worship? Or on Account of their being united under one Ecclesiastical Government, or their having a Right and inherent Power so to do?" as it is stated, p. 106. which you have not set down. But, instead of this, you jumble Things in a confused Mass together, and go to p. 420, 421. and then tell me, you answer negatively, and say, "That the Flock there, can be no other than such a Society of Christians, as every Company of Elders had among them," &c. But, 1. Is not this Exhortation given forth indefinitely to all the Elders? Is not the Flock

committed to these Elders, one Flock, and not Flocks? This was a Flock, including all these different Provinces, and the Professors therein, and organized with Officers. 2. Tho' the Word *Flock* is to be taken distributively, for the several Assemblies included therein, in which Word and Sacraments were to be dispensed; yet they are still one, because these Elders had a Right and habitual Power to rule and govern this one Flock among them, in all such Matters as they were equally concerned in: For all of them had a Charge of this one Flock of God, laid upon them by him who was the Head and Lord thereof. Collective Nouns, tho' they are many Times taken distributively, yet still they express an Unity in some Point, as here in their being united under one King, the same Laws and Regulations, which still hold forth one Community. 3. This lets us see, tho' they could not be particular Examples to that large Flock, but separately, where their Life and Conversation was to be a Pattern to such of them as they had under their immediate Care; yet, as this Flock was one, and had common Interests, so their Rulers had a more extensive Charge in Matters of publick Concern to all of them than their own particular Congregations. 4. Where you alledge, p. 23. That the Church of *Ephesus* was but one worshipping Flock, wherein all its Elders could be its personal Examples, it is indeed a begging of the Question, especially when you have not one Word but your own Assertion against what I have said; for there being more Congregations there than one, p. 412. nay, according to the Account there given, each of the Elders therein could not be a Pattern to all that Flock.

5. Are not the Elders of the different Provinces as expressly required to rule that one Flock, as these of *Ephesus* that which was among them? Let the Unprejudiced compare *Acts* 20. 28. with *1 Pet.* 5. 2. and determine himself. 6. If, according to your Reasoning, *Explicat.* p. 17. and in my Book, 421. the Church of *Ephesus* was but one Congregation, because it was not said, *Many Flocks* and *many Churches*, but *one Flock* and *one Church* in the singular; will it not equally hold, that all these Churches mentioned were one Congregation, seeing they are called one Flock? The Argument, if it be good the one Way, must be equally good the other, it being bottomed on the self-same Foundation, *one Flock* and *one Church*. This you have not seen meet to obviate, tho' it was the main Thing designed, as any will see by reading p. 346, 421. Besides, tho' the Word rendered *Feed*, supposeth the Dispensation of Word and Sacraments; yet its strict Import is to rule and govern: And so this was the Thing given in Commission to these Elders with respect to this one Flock, and herein therein their Unity did consist mainly as to their visible State.

I further told you, That the twelve Tribes scattered, are designed *Church*, James 5. 14. On this Head I asked you, p. 421. if this Church was a single Congregation. To this you reply, p. 33, 34. If I should affirm that the Text points at one Congregation, whereof any one of these to whom he directs, happened to be a Member and sick; and if I should deny that the Apostle any where calls these to whom he directs, the Church, or one Church, you will chuse what you shall say next. But here you have seen meet to cover yourself under a conditional

if, and assert nothing; which is better than to refuse the strongest Scripture-expressions. But to be plain, I say, that all these dispersed *Jews* are expressed by the Word *Church* in the singular Number; and so we are to understand it distributively, for the several Congregations represented by this general Name. But, at the same Time when I say this, still the Church points forth a certain visible Unity among all these single Churches, in that they are all included and expressed under one collective Noun: And so your founding your Arguments on *one Flock* and *one Church*, for making the Disciples of *Ephesus* to be but one Congregation, is to prove too much, and that is to prove nothing at all. Such mean Shifts as these you have Recourse to, will never be of any good Issue.

But, before I leave this Head, let me add these two or three Things; 1. That the Ministers or Elders spoken of in the New Testament, the first Relation, and that which is the Foundation of all the rest they come under, is their being *Stewards* and *Ambassadors* of Christ, the King and Head of his own Church. On this Account they are termed *Ministers of God and Christ*, and *Stewards of the Mysteries of God*, 2 Cor. 6. 4. These and the like Epithets point forth our Lord's Propriety in them, and the special Relation they bear to him, 2 Cor. 3. 6. 2. Under this Relation there is another, namely, that which is by Delegation, when Christ bestows Ministers as a Gift unto his Church; as 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11, 12. Here, not only extraordinary, but ordinary Officers are given to Christ's universal Church, or

visible

visible Body. Thus ordinary Officers have a Relation to the whole Family, or Church of the Redeemer ; and so they are given primarily to the Catholick Body, according to what I have said, p. 348, &c. Accordingly, they have Power to admit Members into the Catholick Church by the Administration of Baptism, and to eject out of it by Excommunication ; for neither the one nor the other have respect to one single Congregation solely.

3. Under this Relation there ariseth another which is more particular and subservient to the former, and that is, that Ministers or Elders are fixed to particular Congregations, and from thence they come to be denominate the Elders of such and such Churches, and not of others, as the Angels of the seven Churches respectively ; This is that which intimates their Propriety in these Churches, and the particular Relation they bore to them. Now, to apply this to the Case in Hand, all the Elders of the different Provinces spoken of by *Peter* and *James*, were the Ambassadors of Christ ; and from this Relation to him, he gave them another to this one Flock and Church, which was his, and over which he was Lord and King ; and then, under this they had their particular Allotments. Thus it is not essential to an Ambassador of Christ, that he be a Minister of this or the other particular Church ; but it is essential to him, that he be a Minister of the Church of Christ or his visible Flock in its large Extent ; for, without a Relation to this, he cannot bear the Name. From this it is natural to perceive, that as these Elders had a Relation to their particular Churches, for the ordinary dispensing of Word and Sacraments, and the more private Acts of Discipline ;

cipline ; yet still all of them were first Ministers of Christ, and, as a Gift by him, they had a Relation to that one Flock or Church which was his, and had a Power to exercise ministerial Acts any where therein, and join in the Matters of Jurisdiction and Discipline, in what related to the whole. Besides, these Churches are all of them exprest by such collective Nouns, as *Church, Flock, Assembly*, and the Churches of *Galatia*, by *one Lump* ; which still holds forth their Unity, and the joint Concern these Elders had in them, and the common Relation they bore to them. In a Word, the Oneness of the Kind of Worship and Government, exprest in these Texts, gives every private Christian in that one Flock or Church an habitual Power and virtual Right to worship God and communicate in any Congregation (tho' never so remote from that in which they are ordinary and stated Members) if Occasion shall serve, and at the same Time makes him liable to Reproofs or Suspension therein, if there be just Cause ; so the Elders of any particular Church have the like Right to exercise their Office in any true Church, tho' they may have their ordinary and fixed Relation to a particular Flock. Thus let the Reader judge, how you have trifled, instead of answering what I have said on the Churches of *Galatia*, &c.

v. 30, 31.

You next come to attack me for saying, The Word *Church* is made Use of to exprest the Pastors and Rulers of the visible Body of Christ, p. 35 and in my Book, p. 52, 53, &c. Here you tell me with a great deal of Warmth, "That I have not only begg'd the Question, but robb'd it." But

refuse
not at
from
ment,
are b
dersta
gether
shall o
52, an
self.
" wh
" den
Sir,
sentin
ther y
on tha
little a
much
ture,
say I
cient
Me
propo
them
put m
" or
" im
" in
" &c
better
ry tha
of the
where
give
re

refuse I have done either : And seeing you have not attempted to answer what I have said, either from the Text or Context, or from the Old Testament, from whence many Terms and Expressions are borrowed in the New, and their right Understanding depends on the comparing the two together, or what I have adduced as Under-proofs ; I shall only refer the Reader to what I have said, p. 52, and 267, &c. and then let him judge for himself. You add, p. 36. " That I cite *Acts* 15. 22. " where the Church is distinguished from the Elders, and prove that it signifies the Elders. " Sir, I have your Word for this Way of representing Things ; but let the Reader judge, whether you have so much as touched what I have said on that Head, p. 91, and 293, 299. You say as little against *Acts* 18. 22. Nor have you ever so much as mentioned what I said on another Scripture, p. 404. which is one more than what you say I have adduced, tho' indeed these were sufficient for all that is brought against them.

Mean while, before I leave this Head, I shall propose two Things more on '*Mat.* 18. and leave them to your cooler Thoughts : The Thing you put me to prove, p. 35. is, " That the Elders here, " or any where else in the New Testament, are " impowered to bind or loose, any otherways but " in Presence, and with the Consent of the Flock, " &c." But, Sir, the Proof would have come better off your own Hand, viz. That it is necessary that the Elders act with, and by the Consent of the Flock : This is a positive Proposition ; whereas you, according to your laudable Custom, give me a Negative to prove. But, 1. Tell the Church,

Church, is meant of a Church of Rulers, and consequently it was them the Text speaks of, as having the Power of binding and loosing, without the least Hint of the Necessity of the Consent of the private Christians. Now, besides what I have said, it must be further considered, 1. If the Church here meant be not a Church only of Rulers, then there may be a worshipping Assembly, or organized Church, consisting of no more but Two or Three; for the Promise made, *v. 20.* is unto that Number, which plainly supposes there may be a Church of no more in Number. Now, when this is the Case, how will the offended Brother, when he calls the Offender privately to remove the Offence, have Two or Three more to go with him if he be not satisfied, which is the second Step? For there are none in the Church but Three. Again, in this supposed Case in the Words, if the two which are both against the one, the one offended and the other only a Witness, shall excommunicate the Person for his Obstinacy; then, as our Lord's Rule in the Gradation is not observed, so there is a Complaint made unto the Church before it be made unto the Church: For here the compleat Gradation is wanting, and the third Step, which is to the Church; and, even according to this, the offended Brother is Judge in his own Cause, whereas he ought to act only the Part of a Plaintiff by all the Rules of common Justice. 2. In these Words, *Mat. 18. 19.* our Lord says, he will hear *Two who shall agree together, touching one Thing on Earth.* Now, is the Church here meant in the preceeding Verse, of a *Congregation of Jesus Christ with its Presbytery*? Or, can there be any Thing more exprefs, than that our Lord intends the

the En
lers in
here m
Presbyt
to whic
not reje
monstra
Church
here to
or Conc
loosing,
and Con
is as lit
the two
Agreem
in order
ing or l
in the
could no
but by
against
the fol
titude o
must de
it in the
over a v
trary to
2. W
is to be
Presbyt
this Te
Keys th
not all
Keys w
were g
the

the Encouragement of the lowest Number of Rulers in any Congregation, which are the Church here meant. No Christian Congregation and its Presbytery, can possibly consist of that Number to which he made his Promise. Thus, if you will not reject these Words, they must stand as a Demonstration that, *Tell the Church*, is meant of a Church Representative; and so there is nothing here to give the least Countenance to the Consent or Concurrence of a Congregation in binding or loosing, or the Necessity of the People's Presence and Consent in jurisdictional Acts: Besides, there is as little to be inferred from the Agreement of the two touching one Thing, for the unanimous Agreement of a Church of Rulers when many, in order to the Determination of Causes, or binding or loosing, which you afterwards cast up: For, in the present supposed Case in the Text, there could not be a Decision where there were only Two, but by their Agreement or joint Act; or by Two against One, if there be Three, as is supposed in the following Verse: But where there are a Multitude of Rulers, the Agreement of the Plurality must determine the Cause, unless we should put it in the Power of any one to have a Negative over a whole Assembly, which is absurd and contrary to common Sense.

2. When you assert, that the Church, *Mat. 18.* is to be meant of a Church of Jesus Christ and its Presbytery, it still goes on the Supposition, that this Text was an Institution and Donation of the Keys thereunto; whereas, it is owned by most, if not all, That the Text supposeth only that the Keys were given to particular Churches. They were given and made over to the Apostles together,

ther, and they being general Officers, standing in fixed and stated Relation to no particular Churches, the Keys came to the Ministry in particular Churches, as Parts of the whole organized Body; and yet at the same Time immediately, and not as if by Commission from the Catholick Church.

You next fall hard on me for wronging you, and that willingly, p. 39. and in my Book, 83, 84. because I insinuate, say you, that the Word *Church* always being taken to denote one Congregation, was an Inference you made from the Nation of *Israel*, its being called a Church, and having one Place of Worship: But, 1. That I inferred it merely from this Antecedent of yours, is false in Fact, as the Places referred to will evince: For I speak expressly of other Grounds and Texts laid down by you, which I refer to be spoken to afterwards as is done, p. 440, &c. And there also I have taken Notice of your Distinction, p. 447. which you complain I have neglected, p. 37. 2. As to my missing the Scope of your reasoning about *Israel's* being one Church, &c. it is owing to my Dulness; for if you had not told me, I had fallen into the same Blunder again, and I make no Doubt some others would have made the like Escape.

You next attack me p. 38. for saying, "The Congregational Shape of the Old Testament is abolished, and the National Shape the *Episcopalians* plead for." But as you have misrepresented my Words; so you have concealed the Page where they are to be found, for End best known to your self, and have jumbled together great many Things together, without either Method or Order. This you desire me, 1. To let the divine Institution in the Old Testament be

proved

proved
partic
one r
are m
No,
85.
in yo
Read
siona
287.
Confi
ledge
the fir
fomet
2. I h
the St
Court
referr
When
Old T
one vi
with
expres
from t
Analog
an har
Govern
as well
ment v
several
verlook
Typical
own A
tive;
Proofs

proved for a *National Church*, in which are many particular Churches united together in the Unity of one visible Church-Government, &c. These I own are my Words ; But, have you told in what Page ? No, this would have marred all. They are p. 85. Now, if you had designed common Justice in your Observes, you would have directed your Reader to p. 257. where the Question about National and Provincial Synods is stated ; and to p. 287. where the Argument taken from the *Jewish Constitution* is handled. And, tho' p. 39. you alledge, That the Synagogues did not appear in the first Formation of that Church ; yet there is something like them of old Time, *Acts* 15. 21. 2. I have not only given you *Jewish Writers* for the Subordination of the Synagogues to a superior Court, but plain Scripture Texts, as the Places referred to will evince, as also p. 85, &c. 3. When you say, You want an Institution in the Old Testament, for an Equality of Rulers in the one visible Church-Government, it is of a Piece with the rest of your Observes. For, p. 283. I expressly declare, That the Argument is not taken from the Identity of the Thing, but by Way of Analogy, p. 288. 4. You tell me, It will not be an hard Task for an *Independent* to prove, that the Government of the *Jewish Church* was Typical, as well as the Worship, &c. That the Government was Moral as to its Essence ; I have given several Reasons, which you have taken care to overlook. But, if you look upon the Whole as Typical, it is incumbent on you to prove your own Affirmative, and not on us to prove a Negative ; but we shall have more of these Kinds of Proofs demanded a little after.

In your 4th *Observe*, p. 40. about Church Members, you tell me, " I have misstated the Question, and wish I had taken the *Thesis* laid down for me, in the *Explication* of your Proposition." Sir, I gave a good Reason towards the End of that Section, beginning p. 108. wherefore I could not take your *Thesis*. 2. I am much mistaken, if the Arguments adduced by me, do not oppose the Notion you frame of a Visible Church. 3. I have explained the Terms the best Way I could, and given the Opinion of the *Independents* on the one Hand, *Platform*, Chap. 14. and the Opinion of the *Presbyterians* on the other, which I look upon to be agreeable to the Notions given us in Scripture, of the Visible Church, both under the Old and New Testament. But what have you brought against my State of the Question? 1. Say you, " I make a credible Profession and blameless Conversation the Ground of admitting Members of the Visible Church." But have you told me in what Page in the *Body* of that Section these Words are to be found? No, the State of the Question p. 117, 118. has neither these Words expressly, nor in the Order you have placed them, tho' you quote them as my express Words. I say there, " With Respect to such as are come out from some false Religion, or Heathenism, they are to be admitted Members of the visible Church, on a sober and morally serious outward Profession of the Faith, together with their Engagement, &c." But, you reckoned a few Words out of the Contents of the Chap. enough, p. 108.

You go on p. 42. to make me inconsistent with myself, because I say, p. 111. " That that which

out

" ou
" hi
" ing
" is
incon
ficers
the
under
Part
or an
where
and
Ones,
Judgm
by th
Chap.
But
of the
" as
" Sea
" is t
" On
" visi
" Cov
but h
ther,
For,
Questi
confid
" wh
" wh
" visi
this I
" is n
" Tit

“ our Lord had in Design, in giving Officers to
 “ his Church, was not for perfecting and build-
 “ ing up a mere visible Church, but that which
 “ is invisible, &c.” But is this any Way
 inconsistent, either with Christ’s giving Of-
 ficers to a Church as Visible, or to my saying
 the Names, *Saints* and *Faithful* are only to be
 understood of the more valueable and better
 Part? Was the Church of *Corinth* particularly,
 or any other mentioned in the New Testament,
 where there were so many abominable Principles
 and Practices abounding, all *Saints* and *Faithful*
Ones, or Members of the mystical Body in the
 Judgment of Charity? This is expressly refused
 by the *Independents* in *New England*, *Platform*
Chap. 14. Parag. 8.

But you add, *p. 43.* That I make the Members
 of the visible Church and their Profession, “ Such
 “ as to have no Title from God, to partake of the
 “ Seals of the New Covenant, but in so far as He
 “ is their God, and they his justified and sanctified
 “ Ones : And for this, and also to prove that the
 “ visible Church, as such, is not within the New
 “ Covenant,” *p. 111.* These are your Words ;
 but how conscientiously they are jumbled toge-
 ther, as expressive of my Mind, will soon appear :
 For, *p. 110.* before I came to the State of the
 Question, and for clearing of it, I said it must be
 considered, 1. “ That the proper Subject with
 “ whom the Covenant of Grace is made, and to
 “ whom the Promises thereof belong, is the in-
 “ visible Church of real Believers,” &c. After
 this I added, “ Thus the visible Church, as such,
 “ is not within the New Covenant, nor have any
 “ Title from God to partake of the Seals thereof,
 “ but

“ but in so far as he is their God, and they his
 “ justified and sanctified Ones.” By this the Reader will see the Disguise put on my Meaning and Words, after they are culled out and altered both in Method and Order, without any Regard either to Scope or Context. The plain Meaning of the Proposition is, That a visible Church, as such, or a mere visible church, is not savingly within the Bond of the Covenant of Grace : For it is impossible that that which is merely visible can constitute the Nature of that which is invisible, as the Reader will see by reading p. 109, 110. For in these I plainly show the Ground of the Distinction between visible and invisible Members ; and that these are not two distinct Churches, or different Species of Churches, but that it is a Distribution of the Subject by the Adjunct, viz. by a twofold Way of Communion, external and internal. Such as have spiritual and internal Communion with Christ, are said to be invisible Members, as known to God only, having this Seal *the Lord knoweth them that are his.* Again, Such as have external Communion in outward Ordinances are called visible Members, because their Communion is visible and apparent to Men. Now, there is no Opposition between a Person’s having a visible and invisible Communion also ; but there is, between him that hath only a merely visible Communion, and him that has an invisible Communion. These are not the same Subject, but are as far different as Believer and Unbeliever : So I think it obvious, that a visible Church, as such, or merely on account of its Visibleness, is not savingly interested in God. But after you have strained and altered my Words, you add, p. 44. “ By this you

“ effa

“ establish a Difference very considerable between
 “ the Church of the Old and New Testament.”
 How do I this ? 1. *Say you*, “ All that Church was
 within that Covenant made with them, &c.” But,
 Sir, were all these that came out of *Egypt* saving-
 ly within the Bond of the Covenant of Grace? That
 they were externally in Covenant, is plain, as I
 expressly declared afterwards ; but here I was ex-
 pressly speaking of the invisible Church of true
 Saints, tho’ you was pleased to conceal it. 2. *Say*
you, “ The visible Church had from God, by his
 “ express Law, a Right to the Seals of the Cove-
 “ nant.” But so have all the Churches in the
 New Testament an express Law requiring them to
 partake of the holy Sacrament of the Lord’s Sup-
 per, and binding them at the same Time to do it
 in Faith ; by which alone they come to have a
 saving Title and inward Seal of the Spirit, arising
 from an Interest in Christ, to partake thereof. This
 is what I have advanced ; the Reader may judge
 of your Conduct.

After you have said a great deal, and made fla-
 ming Speeches on the misconstrued Sense you
 put on my Words, and about the Notions you
 have of Brotherly-Love, without ever meddling
 with my Arguments, you come p. 51, 52. to cite
 some Words from me, without citing the Page,
 and interject your own Flights and ludicrous Ban-
 ters, to affect you know whom : But these are
 Methods unbecoming the Sobriety of a Christian,
 or such as write under Pretensions of a *Debt* they
 owe unto *Truth*, which in the Conclusion you say
 was your Motive. The Page is 163. where I an-
 swer an Objection which the Independents urge
 from 2 *Tim.* 3. 5. And you tell me, *I maliciously*
per-

pervert the holy Word of God, and so the great *Calvin* is chargeable with the same Crime, seeing I cited him on this Text and Context: But it seems it was enough that you made this Charge, tho' you should never give any suitable Proof of my Perverseness.

You next tell me, p. 53. " That I have taken up
 " the poor old Cant against the *Independents*, That
 " a Minister, according to their Scheme, cannot
 " Preach as a Minister of the Gospel, to any,
 " but the Flock to which he is a Pastor. " The
 Reader may consider what I have said on this
 Head, p. 332. 337, 338. For my Observer has
 taken care not to mention these Pages, lest the
 Reader might have easy Access to see the Justness
 of the Consequences, and to have perceived them
 owned, even by the *Independents*. Nay, the An-
 swer of the *Elders* of the several Churches in *New*
England, unto the 9th Prop. p. 8. assert the same
 Thing. Their Words are these, " If you mean
 " by Ministerial Act, such an Act of Authority,
 " and Power in dispensing God's Ordinances, as
 " a Minister doth perform to the Church where-
 " unto he is called to be a Minister, then we
 " deny that he can so perform any Ministerial
 " Act to any one other Church but his own,
 " because his Office extends no further than his
 " Call. " The same Thing is owned in the
Platform, Chap. 9. § 7. and by Mr. *Bartlet* in his
Model, p. 69. Thus, Sir, if your Church be in-
 dependent on all other Churches in the World,
 and you receive your Powers from them, then
 you may determine how these can extend fur-
 ther than your own Church, from whom you re-
 ceived them. But you add, " Every Pastor of a
 " Church

" Church is set there for spreading of the Go-
 " spel in the World, as a Light on the Golden
 " Candlestick, and bears Christ's Commission to
 " Preach the Gospel to every Creature." But,
 where is that Commission to be read ? For you have
 not mentioned the Text. Is it *Mark* 16. 15 ? If
 that be your Commission, then *Mat.* 28. 19. is its
 Parallel. But, 1. Who made the Investiture of this
 this Commission to you in an Independent Church,
 where there are no mo Pastors but yourself ?
 seeing the New Testament gives no Instance of
 Ordination but by Pastors. 2. Whether was your
 Church constitute by Pastors, or did they constitute
 themselves into a Church-State without Pastors ?
 If the first, then from whom was it that the In-
 vestiture of Christ's Commission was made to you,
 when as yet there was no Church in Being, till
 after formed by you ? If the latter, then see how
 these who are independent on all other Churches
 on Earth, can make the Investiture of a Commis-
 sion to you, that gives you Power to preach the
 Gospel to all Creatures under Heaven, or through-
 out the whole Catholick Church ? 3. If you lay
 Claim to this Commission, then it must undeni-
 ably follow, there is a Catholick Church visible :
 For, if the Charter by which the Church is con-
 stitute be Catholick, then I humbly conceive the
 Church constitute by it is one Catholick Church ;
 but the former is true by your owning the fore-
 mentioned Texts as your Commission, and conse-
 quently the latter : For it is to me plain, that
 one Charter or universal Commission, containing
 visible Powers and external Administrations to be
 performed, makes one universal Polity or Society :
 And this is so plain, that I have not yet met with
 I any

any real Independent, or any who embraced all these Notions, that lays Claim to that Commission; but still lodge their Powers in the Churches, of which any one is a Minister, because they perceived what was the Consequence. Thus the *New England's Platform*, Chap. 9. Besides, this Commission was first given to the Apostles, and hereby they were constitute universal Pastors, and received Power to gather and plant the Church of Christ, no less than build it up when planted: The Apostles were indeed universal Officers of the Catholick Church visible; for, as their Commission was universal, so they had no Limits of Place, but were over all the Churches, and yet are not said to be set in the Churches, but *the Church*, 1 Cor. 12. 28. And so, tho' ordinary Ministers are not universal Pastors, yet, by Vertue of this Commission, they are Officers of the universal Church, and have habitual Power, which they may exerce in Preaching authoritatively as Christ's Ambassadors, even to those who are without, no less than those who are within, on proper Occasions. 4. If there be one visible Catholick Church, constitute by one Catholick Charter or Commission; then, how will this stand with every particular Church its being independent on all Jurisdiction under Heaven besides its own, when every single Church is Member or Part of the Catholick Body? This Church in which Officers are set, or to which they are given by its adorable Head and Lawgiver, is not a mere *Idea* or *second Notion* in a Man's Brain as you formerly alledged; for all the Members of it are required to have Care one of another, and keep themselves from Schism; and, for this End both Apostles, prophets and Teachers were given

unto

unto it, 1 Cor. 12. 25, 28. and v. 27. they are expressly called *the Body of Christ, and Members one of another.* And here I shall take the Confession of our Independent Brethren in *New England, Platform, Chap. 2. § 3.* “The militant Church is to be considered as visible and invisible: Invisible, with respect to their Relation wherein they stand to Christ as a Body unto the Head, being united unto him by the Spirit of God, and Faith in their Hearts; Visible, in respect of the Profession of their Faith, in their Persons, and in particular Churches, &c. § 6. A congregational Church, by the Institution of Christ, is a Part of the visible militant Church.”

But I find the Presbyterians are as inconsistent as the Independents, p. 53. But, how comes this about? “We do not, *say you*, pretend to be more than Pastors to the Catholick Church visible; and so, by the same Rule, you preach only as private Persons to the rest of the World.” But, 1. We say, that Ministers are Officers of the Catholick Church visible; and so says the Apostle, 1 Cor. 12. 28. 2. The same Commission, by which the Catholick Church visible is constitute, gives Ministers an authoritative Power to preach to *Heathens* and *Pagans*, in order to bring them in to the Church, that they may receive the stated and orderly Dispensation of Ordinances, as well as it makes them Ministers of that Church when gathered.

You next tell me, p. 54. that I affirm, p. 153. “That he who is baptized, according to the Command of Christ, has thereby a sealed Right to all the external Privileges belonging to that Covenant of which Baptism is a Seal; and this con-

“ tinues till it be forfeited by some Deed or Action
 “ of the Person.” This you desire me to recon-
 cile with what I say, p. 111, and 118. which I
 shall do in few Words : p. 111. I hold, that none
 have a saving Right to the spiritual and saving
 Benefits of the Covenant of Grace, but Believers
 in Christ ; p. 18. That an external Profession of
 the true Religion, is sufficient to a Man’s being
 received a Member of the visible Church ; and,
 p. 153. That a Person being baptized, according
 to the Command of Christ, has a sealed Right, &c.
 Now, where is the Contradiction ? Are these Pro-
 positions contradictory, opposed one to another ?
 But by this Time I am inured with such Kind of
 Answers.

You next tell me of a Supposition of mine,
 p. 54. viz. “ That the Heart-searching Word of
 “ God in the Mouth of a Pastor, cannot convince
 “ and convert a Hypocrite that is a Church-
 “ member, and charitably judged a Brother in
 “ Christ by the Pastor,” &c. But where are
 there any such Words of mine, or in what Page
 of my Book ? This is somewhat of a Piece with
 the rest of your Observes. Therefore, 1. I de-
 sire the Reader may examine p. 132. and see if I
 have insinuate any such Supposition: Then, next,
 compare what is there said, with p. 147. and
 judge if there be any Inconsistencies between these
 Places. In a Word, I am there speaking, not as
 to the Facts, what Independent Brethren preach ;
 but how their Preaching hings with their Prin-
 ciples, which you have taken Care not to touch.
 As to my Meaning about *positive Evidences*, I can
 express it no clearer than what I have done ; and

he

he that is not wilfully blind, may easily perceive I did not intend infallible Ones. I could be very clear to admit a Heathen to be a Member of the visible Church, on his moral and seemingly serious Profession of the Gospel; tho' at the same Time I could not determine myself he was to be esteemed a Member of the Mystical Body.

But, leaving your indefinite Charges, I come to the last Thing under this Observe, p. 56. where you desire me "To give exprefs Scripture-proof for this Proposition, without telling you of all orthodox Divines, viz. *That a Person being over-taken in some Fault, must be debarred from sealing Ordinances, till the Scandal be removed, according to Christ's Rule.*" But here you have not seen meet to set down the Page, lest you should have been charged with plain Dealing. It is p. 114. But, 1. Let me see exprefs Scripture for your asserting this Proposition, viz. *The Apostles and Elders of the Church in Jerusalem.* 2. I shall not offer you Presbyterian orthodox Divines, but Independents, whom you cannot refuse, unless you reject them as Brethren also. The Persons I mean are the Independents in *N. England*, Platform, Chap. 14. § 2. who say, ——— "Which declaring the Offender to ly under the publick Offence of the Church, doth thereby withhold or suspend him from the holy Fellowship of the Lord's Supper, till his Offence be removed by a penitent Confession." This is their Judgment on *Mat. 18.* and I wish both they and I be not called malicious Perverters of the Text. They also cite *Mat. 5. 23, 24. Luke 17. 3, 4. Tit. 3.* as the Foundation of their Opinion.

The

Let me add, that the Word preached is the necessary and appointed Mean for the Conversion of the most flagitious and lewd Hearers; and tho' they prophane the Word of Promise, and despise an offered Christ in the Preaching of the Word, yet Ministers, in allowing such within the visible Church, are not accessary to their Abuse of their Mercy, seeing they are under a Necessity of offering Christ preached, as the only ordinary and necessary Mean of Salvation. So they are admitted to the stated and ordinary Hearing of the Word, and made the Objects of the pastoral Care, that even they may be brought in to believe in Christ, the only ordinary possible Mean for that End: Thus their stumbling at the Word is by Accident, and the Abuse comes from themselves. But, as the Lord's Supper is a Seal of our Nourishment, and spiritual Growth in Christ, presupposeth Faith, and the begun Work of God in the Partakers. Now, these who are open flagitious, and evidence themselves Unbelievers when Members, are not to be admitted to partake of the Sacrament of the holy Supper:

1. This Ordinance is not an ordinary necessary Mean of Conversion, seeing Meat or Drink, these Elements, cannot nourish those who have nothing of the Life of God in them.
2. It is not a probable Mean or Seal to any Person, till he believe in Christ; seeing it can seal nothing that is saving to a Person, who is not capable of Nourishment nor of being sealed up in growing Communion with Christ.

Thus, as the Lord's Supper is not a formal Mean of Conversion, but of further Growth and Nourishment to those that are already converted; so these who give no Discoveries

is th
verfi
; an
e, an
of th
hin th
Abu
Neces
only or
So the
Heari
e past
n to be
e Mea
e Wor
n them
l of ou
hrift,
of G
open
believ
to p
: F
ecessa
rink,
no ha
2. It
till
g that
shme
amun
is n
further
alrea
veries
th

their Belief in Christ, are not to be admitted to partake of that Ordinance, lest they prophane the holy Things of God, and the Minister be accessory thereto : But in the Admission of Members to the visible Church this cannot be said, this being the necessary and ordinarily possible Mean of Conversion. These Things being duly considered, I humbly conceive the Noise about the Admission of Members to the visible Church might soon vanish ; and the Distinction is supported by the following Scriptures, *Mat.* 7. 6. *2 Thess.* 3. 6, 14, 15. *1 Cor.* 11. 27. to the End. But I haste, having designed Brevity.

I come next to your 5th *Observe*, p. 57. in which you tell me, I have not attended to the " Nature of the Argument about the Church of " *Jerusalem*, &c." What can be the Reason of my Escape in this ? 1. Say you, " When it is " alledged by us, that the Scripture-language, in " the Description of the Church at *Jerusalem*, " makes for one Congregation ; you affirm that " it is impossible it could be so : So that the " whole of your Cause depends on the Proof of " this Impossibility, — We have nothing to prove " till you instruct your Impossibility," &c. Sir, under Favour, we do not undertake the Proof of a Negative ; and your bare Assertions will not pass for Demonstrations. It is not your saying, the Scripture-language speaks thus, or the other Way, that will determine a Cause ; your Word will not be admitted as canonical with the thinking Part of Mankind. Besides, have you not read what I undertook to prove, p. 184 ? No, this was not expedient, seeing you durst not adventure to make an Answer to my Arguments.

The

The Proposition I laid down to be proven, was *That in the Church of Jerusalem, there were several Congregations of Christians, which met for public Worship, &c.* This was my Positive, and I alleged four Arguments for the Confirmation of it, and so we shall examine what you have brought against these. 1. Say you, "I must prove that all these converted at *Jerusalem*, were Members of that Church." This I have done, so far as concerned my Proposition, from p. 186. to 199. But you can advance, instead of answering, "That when we come to speak of Impossibilities, it will be hard to prove it impossible that there were not Churches throughout *Judea* and *Galatia* before the Dispersion." Sir, who is it that shifts Scripture-proof now? Let me see one Assertion of mine so disrespectful to sacred History, in giving an exact and circumstantiate Account of the Way how, and the Occasion by which the Gospel came to go forth from *Jerusalem*, as this is yours. We are not here to speak of absolute Impossibilities, or Possibilities; but what we have Ground to believe, after the Holy Ghost, has been so express as to this Point, *Acts* 8. By this we have a Swatch of your Candor among other Instances.

2. Say you, "It must also be made manifest, that there was no Place before the Dispersion, where all the Members of this Church could possibly meet as one Congregation." Thus we must again prove a Negative. But either answer what I have said, p. 204, &c. or else prove your own Affirmative. All they to whom *Peter* preached, no doubt understood him, when he spoke in their Languages they were versant in; but that he de-

livered

livered himself only in one Language, is not said, who' the Substance of his Sermon is narrated to us by the sacred Historian in *Greek*.

3. Say you, "I must prove there was no common Language among the Disciples at *Jerusalem*." Thus I have another Negative. But, if you have the Honour of a Disputant, prove the Affirmative; for I have made it good there were a Diversity of Languages and Dialects among them. And when you have finished this, then give a suitable Proof they were all as well acquainted with that common Language, and capable of being instructed in it, as in their native Tongue: For without this my Argument is still conclusive.

4. Say you, "I must also prove, That the twelve Apostles, the then Pastors of that Church, could not find Room for their Gifts in a Church that assembled every Day in the Temple." By this I have a third Negative; but I shall leave you to prove the Affirmative, and then draw the Conclusion.

5. Say you, It must next be made appear, that when the Dispersion was, any more of the Church remained in *Jerusalem*, than as many as could assemble in one Place." This, in the Issue, is a Negative also; and so I leave you to prove the Affirmative; and when you have done our Cause is intire. The Reader may consider what I have said on this Head, p. 192, &c. and then judge of your Way of answering. This is all you have said.

6. Say you, "I must also demonstrate, that all the Myriads of the believing Jews were Members of the Church at *Jerusalem*." I have

given my Reasons why I thought these mentioned, *Acts 21.* were Members of that Church, and have not as yet seen any Answer. This I have spoke to before, and also in my Book, p. 241. *You add*, p. 60. "That I may try my critical Skill on the Word *Myriads*, to shew that it always, in the New Testament, is to be taken to signify *Ten thousands*, and that it must be so taken *Luke 12. 1.*" To this I answer, 1. That the *Myriads* spoken of in that Text, was not one Congregation ordinarily meeting to hear one Pastor, to judge all the People, oversee their Manners, and communicate at one Table. The contrary of this is expressly declared, and the great Disorder among them is pointed out in most emphatick Terms, *They trode one on another*, and were in great Confusion, contrary to that Order and Regularity required in the Church-assemblies, *1 Cor. 14.* This was indeed a Mob, and much occasioned on Account of a Miracle; and can be no Argument for the Paucity of their Number, seeing Experience tells us, what Numbers many Times are crouded together on singular Actions. 2. When I compare several Texts in which I find this Word made Use of, such as *Heb. 2. 12. Jude 14. Rev. 5. 11.* I have no Hesitation to believe, that many *Ten thousands* were expressed by it. The Word I own is for most Part a definite Number put for an indefinite; and in all these Texts it questionless includes more than the precise Number signified by that Word. 3. The Word, *Acts 21. 29.* is introduced with strong Emphasis, *How many Ten thousands.* It is not only *Myriads*, but, how many *Myriads*, or *Ten thousands*. Thus I part with you on the

Head
bold
Weig
of th
such
shall
to the
other
Head
repre
I c
when
Answ
Judica
Carpi
the P
your
" not
" but
" my
blishe
my E
" tru
" Th
" wen
" Pro
" the
" join
" Or
" Pla
" affe
to th
the w
disting

Head of the Church of *Jerusalem*, and leave your bold Assertions in the Conclusion to have what Weight they will with your Admirers ; for I am of the Mind they will have little Weight with such as are capable to judge for themselves. I shall only add, That it will be more than difficult to shew any real Opposition between me and the other Person you insinuate, who has written on this Head. Your Dexterity in this Point consists in Misrepresentations, Concealments, and such Practices.

I come next to your 6th *Observe*, p. 62. and when I have gone over it, instead of any direct Answer to me, on the Head of the Subordination of Judicatories, I find nothing but poor Shifts and Carplings, with long Stories that come not near the Point in Debate, repeated over and over in your *Missive*. 1. Say you, p. 62. " You have not yet manifested a visible Body of Christ, but a Congregation of visible Members of his mystical Body, &c. " But, say I, I have established this Head already, and more than once in my Book. 2. You tell me, p. 64. " Were it true, as it is false, that you say, p. 88. 89. " That Gospel-Ordinances and Church-Privileges were given primarily to the Universality of Professors ; and that particular Assemblies have their Rise merely from the Impossibility of their joining together --- Unto whom does the Gift of Ordinances and Privileges belong in the next Place, ---- but unto them that can conveniently assemble for the Enjoyment of them all ? " To this I answer, That *primarily* they belong unto the whole Body, and *secondarily* unto the several distinct Congregations, which are Parts or Mem-

bers of that whole Body. This has been already spoke to, and all your popular Harangue comes not near the Question.

3. You tell me, p. 65. " That the Scripture
" Unity, or Oneness of these Churches, and
" of the Catholick Church, noways favour
" Provincial and National Synods, &c. " But

1. What *Presbyterian* ever asserted, that the Catholick Body visible, is one external stated and actual Assembly? But of this before. 2. If the Catholick Body be an Object of Sense, then it is visible, and may be seen. 3. That which is revealed, is an Article I am bound to believe; but that there is such a Thing as a Catholick visible Church revealed, is evident from the Scriptures mentioned by me, and not yet answered but by Assertions. 4. You further add, in the Excess of your Modesty, " That you know no visible Union of this Body — except you could make one visible Pastor and Bishop, &c. But we contend, That that visible Bishop you insinuate, has all along been against General Councils, as I could evince in several Instances, were needful; and all we plead for, is none of his favourite Principles. I am not to insist on the Account you give of your Faith on this Head, is only clear Arguments and Answers I am concerned with.

4. You tell me, p. 70. " That the Gift of Officers for perfecting and edifying the Body of Christ, in the Scripture-Account of it, gives no Support to the Subordination of Judicatories, but the contrary. " This is hard. But how is it made good? O, it is very clear, say you, " Your Argument, p. 88. to prove that this

" Gift

ready
 come
 ipture
 and
 avour
 But
 at the
 d and
 If the
 the
 which
 to be
 g as
 eviden
 d no
 further
 at you
 excep
 p, &c.
 you in
 Coun
 were
 of h
 on the
 lead,
 m con
 e of O
 e Bod
 t, give
 Judica
 d. But
 ear, fa
 at thi
 " Gift

" Gift was not made to Congregations, will with
 " equal Evidence manifest, that it was not made
 " to your Catholick visible Body." But, who
 ever said, that the Gift of Officers was not made
 to particular Congregations? Mean while, let us
 see the Proof. It appears, *say you*, because I say,
The Apostles were not a Deed of Gift to particular
Congregations, their Commission extending to the whole
World. This was told before, and answered.
 Christ's Commission impowered the Apostles to
 gather a Church from the four Winds of the
 Earth, and to be Catholick Officers in it when
 gathered. What is this but a pitiful Juggle?
 You come to answer my Argument, p. 263. (tho'
 concealed by you) and then go back to p. 88. and
 cull out half a Sentence in the midst of the Con-
 nexion, because you were aware of meddling
 with it in Gross. In the same p. you tell me,
 " That sometimes I acknowledge, that the Body,
 " for perfecting of which Christ gave the A-
 " postles, &c. is the invisible Church, &c." But,
 1. I am still of the Opinion, That inten-
 tionally the Apostles were given, not to build up
 a mere visible Church, but that which is invisible
 also; but at the same Time hold, that they
 were given to the Church as visible; and, under
 this abstract Notion, it consisted both of good
 and bad. But, if we take it in a complex Sense,
 then its Members are a Part of the Catholick in-
 visible Church, and the truly valuable Part of
 the visible Church here on Earth. 2. The A-
 postles were given to be Pastors of this whole uni-
 versal Body, and not fixed to any particular
 Congregation, 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11, 12.
 Both which Scriptures are owned to speak of the
 visible

visible Church Catholick, by no less learned Independent than *Hooker*, as was before noted. But, not to repeat what has been before said to the present Purpose, nor to insist on your strong Assertions and uncharitable Charges, I shall only add, That I never understood *Psal.* 68. as a Prophecy concerning the Church as invisible, which you insinuate without any just Ground.

You next come to my 2d Argument, p. 76. which is founded on *Mat.* 18. here you say, " That " this Text is as clear against me, as any of the " Words that began to be spoken by our Lord himself " while here on Earth. " But indeed this is nothing against me at all, but the contrary : But you add, " I rest satisfied in the Apostolick Explication of " them, *1 Cor.* 5. 11. compared with *Acts* 10. " 28. Now, because I am wearied, and incline to " make short Work, I refer you to examine what " I have said about the Church of *Corinth*, and " that amazing Sentence, p. 451, &c. which is " yet untouched by you. " Again, you tell me, " That these Words, *Mat.* 18. have no Reference to the Jewish Church, or to the Manner of their Excommunication ; " But, all I have for this is your Word, and therefore pass it. You add, " That when I alledge, that our Scheme of Government was in the Jewish Church, and that every Thing else but it, in the Order of that Church, is abolished, — you might as well make no Pretence about the Jewish Church, and establish it on Nature's Light ; — for it is your right Reason tells you what is Moral in this Case, and what not. " But I answer, Is Man to lay aside Reason in explaining Scripture, and deducing Consequences therefrom,

or in
the C
we t
we t
this i
at th
clear
Natur
Reaso
But f
mihi,
" Re
" of
" of
" and
" nat
" tur
" wh
Sir,
never
as a M
But th
texts,
" the
" for
" the
" tha
" me
have
this A
all alo
save o
Mind
and th
tho' t

or in judging what is Moral, and what Typical in the Old Testament? By what Means then are we to judge of the Meaning of Scripture? Are we to expect immediate Revelation, to tell us, this is Moral and that is Typical? In a Word, at this Rate, no Scripture-consequence, however clear and evident, is of Divine Authority, but only *Nature's Light*, seeing Men made Use of their Reason in deducing these from their Premises. But says the learned Dr. Owen on *Heb.* Vol. 2. *mihi*, p. 217. "The Validity of the Apostle's Reasoning, sometimes depends on the Certainty of Logical Maxims; and so to deny this Liberty of deducing Consequences, or one Thing from another, according to the just Rules of Ratiocination, is quite to take away the Use of Scripture, and to banish Reason from those Things wherein it ought to be principally employed." Sir, if I were at an End of this Missive, I hope never to engage with One that has cast off Reason as a Mean of judging concerning Things Sacred: But this is of a Piece with your disregarding Contexts, as before, p. 17. In *fine*, you add, "That the Jews were bound to reprove one another for Sin, there is no Question; but how you find the second Degree of Admonition in these Texts, that shew Facts behove to be proved in Judgment," &c. Here, in your usual Method, you have concealed the Pages of my Book, where this Argument and these Texts are to be seen, and all along, since you entered on these Arguments, save once; The *Page* is 268. Now, I am of the Mind I was in the right in citing these Scriptures, and that they prove all that was intended by me, tho' they were a Rule also to establish Facts in criminal

minal Causes : So, Deut. 19. 15. *One Witness shall not rise up against a Man for any Iniquity, or for any Sin, in any Sin that he sinneth : At the Mouth of two Witnesses, or three, &c.* Here is a general Rule without Restriction ; and I find our Independent Brethren in *New England*, Platform, Cha. 14. § 2. take it in the same Latitude I have done : Their Words are on the second Degree of Admonition, " But if the Offender hear not his " Brother, the Brother offended is to take with " him one or two more, that in the Mouth of " two or three Witnesses every Word may be established. " The same Rule is alluded to, 1 Tim. 5. 19. Besides, the same Independent Brethren hold, Platform, Chap. 15. That the Degrees of Admonition extend unto Churches by Way of Proportion, no less than private Offences. The same Thing is expressly owned by Mr. Parker, in his *Polit. Eccles.* L. 3. p. 23, 355. Thus my Reasoning, Chap. 5. on Mat. 18. and p. 270, &c. is owned to be good even by the Independents, as to the Subordination of Courts ; and I find nothing you have advanced against it, save in Assertions without any suitable Proof : As for your impertinent Questions, and Wranglings instead of Answers, from p. 78. to 83. as they do not touch the Strength of my Argument, so they are Signs of a desperate Cause : And the very Foundation of your Cavils and Quibbles on Mat. 18. hath been more than once spoken to in this Missive. As for your pitying me for having so much to do with Jewish Writers, and canting over to you a deal of Stuff, I am obliged to you for your fatherly Concern, but shall be glad I have never greater Need of Compassion. I shall only further observe

what

what you say, p. 79. about Women: Say you, "As
 " to Women, you must be determined by your
 " Sense of 1 Cor. 14. whatever it be." Again,
 p. 80. "You may also thus debar them from sing-
 " ing of Psalms, &c." To these I answer, That
 I have already shewn, that the Church, *Mat.* 18.
 is not to be understood of private Members, but
 only of Rulers, and consequently Women have
 no Concern in jurisdictional Transactions, either
 by Assent or Dissent. Besides, if Women may
 speak in the Exercise of Discipline, and give their
 Suffrage in inflicting the Sentence of Excommuni-
 cation, then they may equally speak in the Exer-
 cise of all lesser Censures; for the lesser are still
 included in the greater: But so it is, that a Woman
 is no where authorized, so far as I know, to re-
 buke her Husband, her Father or Pastor, especi-
 ally in an assembled Church, this being a Degree
 of Teaching, and indeed to usurp Authority over
 the Man, expressly contrary to 2 *Tim.* 2. 12. I
 had almost forgot, that you tell me, That we may
 as well debar them for singing Psalms; God forbid.
 This minds me of the *Female* Writer against *Ed-
 wards*, p. 7. who says on this Head. *Private
 Christians may pray, &c.* But these Arguments will
 not be conclusive, that are *affirmative a genere ad
 speciem*. Excuse the Logicks. Because she may
 pray or sing Psalms, is a bad Argument to infer,
 she may be concerned in the Exercise of Discipline
 and Government in the Church. I must now own,
 I am wearied with such Trifling, and Stories in-
 stead of Answers, and therefore shall haste to a
 Close.

You come next, p. 83. to my Argument on *Acts*
 15. and tell me, "It is as clear a Pattern of the

L

Con.

“ Congregational Way, and so against the Subor-
 “ dination of Judicatories, as is to found in
 “ any one Passage of the *Acts*. ” My Answer is
 very short, namely, That there is not one Passage
 in the *Act* against the Subordination of Judicato-
 ries, nay, nor in the whole New Testament;
 Mean Time, have you made any direct Answer to
 what I have said against you on this Head? Not
 one Word; nor have you referred to one Page in
 my Book about it, tho’ I have delivered my Mind
 from p. 288, to 328. But passing your Preamble,
 wherein you wonder that this Text should be so
 much insisted on, as a Pattern for Synods of any
 Kind, &c. The most remarkable Thing I find on
 this Head, is a long Discourse made up of *if’s* and
but’s; and then after you have told Things in that
 comical Dress, you desire me to draw my Conclu-
 sion from what you have said, and say, “ Whe-
 “ ther the whole Church here distinguished from
 “ the Presbytery of *Jerusalem*, be the Commis-
 “ sioners from *Antioch*, &c.” But is this the
 Way of a Disputant, to frame Premisses to himself,
 without answering these of his Antagonist, and then
 desire him to draw his Conclusion. I laid down
 Premisses that will support my Conclusions, and
 you have not attempted to give any Answer to
 them, more than by Antiscriptural Assertions, as
 will soon appear. In this Manner you tell me, p.
 87. “ That it is very clear that *Paul* and *Barnabas*
 “ were not Members of the Synod at *Jerusalem*,
 “ from *Acts* 15. 22.” But where does this Clear-
 ness appear? Is it because *Paul* and *Barnabas* are
 mentioned as the Persons with whom *Judas* and
Silas were to go down to *Antioch*? This is all I
 can find. Now, how is this Consequence proven,
 namely,

name
 that
 were
Barna
 of th
 That
 Chur
Jame
 there
 pany
 this
 is eq
 swad
 Affe
 for i
 nical
 “ th
 “ w
 “ de
 “ an
 “ st
 “ en
 “ fa
 “ C
 But
 say,
 “ an
 “ in
 “ w
 “ fa
 cove
 ons
 the
 was
 that

namely, Because *Paul* and *Barnabas* are named by that Synod, as Persons with whom *Judas* and *Silas* were to go down to *Antioch* : Therefore *Paul* and *Barnabas* were not of that Company, or Members of that Synod ? I suppose it should have been said, That it pleased the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church, &c. to send chosen Men with *Peter* and *James* to *Antioch* ; will this Conclusion be good ; therefore they were not Members of that Company who sent *Judas* and *Silas* with them : Yet this Conclusion, by all that I am able to perceive, is equally good with the former ; and I am persuaded you are among the first that ever held this Assertion, but we have nothing but your Word for it, which you force us to believe is not Canonical ; for, p. 85. “ You say this whole Church, “ this Company of Brethren, was a Company, to “ which the Account of the Miracles and Wonders God had done among the *Gentiles* by *Paul* “ and *Barnabas*, was News, and to which the Disturbance made at *Antioch* by the false Teachers and their Doctrine was known only by Hearsay, and that from *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and the “ Commissioners from *Antioch*. v. 12, 23, 24.” But in your Speech before the Commission, p. 9. you say, “ These Decrees were ordained by the Apostles “ and these Elders, with the Brethren that were “ in *Jerusalem*, before the Question and Dispute “ was raised at *Antioch* ; even that Company that “ says, v. 23, 24.” Now, I desire you may discover to your Admirers, which of these Assertions are truest, viz. The Decrees were ordained by the Apostles, &c. before the Question and Dispute was raised at *Antioch* ; or whether the News of that Dispute behoved to be notified to the Apostles and

and Elders, &c. by *Paul* and *Barnabas* and the *Commissioners* from *Antioch*, before any Decrees about it could be enacted? Sir, you have a Dexterity in raising imaginary Inconsistencies, and I expect you will shew an equal Skill in reconciling a real one.

Now, I find I am turned over to your *Speech* before the *Commission*; as for your *Answer* to the *Defence* of *National Churches*, that Author is fully able to defend himself, if there were any Occasion: You say, p. 9. in your *Speech*, *The Decrees about the keeping of Moses's Law by the Gentiles, were ordained by the Apostles and Elders of the Church in Jerusalem.* Now, I desire you may let me see any Scripture in the New Testament that will vouch this Assertion, either expressly or by lawful Consequence: The same Thing you repeat, p. 10. and bring *Acts* 16. 4. as a Proof of it, which in express Words declares the contrary: For instead of saying, *The Apostles and Elders of the Church in Jerusalem*, it says, *The Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem.* From which I here undertake to prove, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* were Members of that Assembly, wherein the Decrees were enacted, which is refused by you, p. 9. and since in your *Letter*, notwithstanding I had expressly quarrelled it in my Book, p. 319. my Proof is thus, the Decrees were ordained by the Company of the *Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem*, *Acts* 16. 4. but *Paul* and *Barnabas* were *Apostles*, and at *Jerusalem* when the Decrees were enacted: Therefore *Paul* and *Barnabas* were of the Company who enacted these Decrees. But because I make Use of my Reason in drawing this Conclusion, I am

afraid

afraid you will cast the whole : And therefore I
 must take the Freedom to tell you, that it is
 owned by the Independents in *New England*, who
 expressly take *Acts 15.* to be a Pattern of Synods,
 and say, these are an Ordinance of Christ, and that
Paul and Barnabas were Delegates from the Church
Antioch, and Members of that Synod, *P. 87. of*
chap. 16. § 1, 6. You tell me further, *p. 87. of*
 your Letter, "That you can find no Mention
Paul and Barnabas giving their Judgment and
 Suffrage." But what I have said, and the very
 words you cite, *v. 22.* discover they gave their
 suffrage; and what is said, *v. 12.* clearly intimates
 they gave their Judgment, and that in Confe-
 rence of what *Peter* had spoke, and the Thing
 delivered by them was plainly on the Cause, and
 that related to the *Gentiles* of whom *Peter* was
 scourging.

You add *p. 10.* of your Speech, "That the
 false Teachers used the Authority of the A-
 postles and Elders of this Church, from whence
 they came out, against *Paul and Barnabas*, *v. 1.*
2, 24, 25." But does the Text say, That
 these false Teachers came to *Antioch* from the
 Church of *Jerusalem*? Nay, does it not expressly
 declare, they came down from *Judea*, *v. 1.* Now,
 according to your own Argument, the *Certain*
which came out from us, *v. 23, 24.* must imply,
 that the Elders of the Church of *Judea* were
 there; seeing these false Teachers that came from
 thence, are said to come out from Us. If they
 came from *Judea*, then the Persons from whom
 they came, there mentioned, must be the Elders
 of these Churches, no less than that of *Jerusalem*,
 which was but one of them. And what is more,
 there

there is not the least Innuendo, v. 4. that the Elders spoken of, were only these of *Jerusalem*, any more than that the Apostles were only the Apostles of that Church; which is absurd. Nor is there the least Insinuation, that the Church mentioned in that Verse, came together with the Apostles and Elders, but the contrary, v. 6. Again, p. 11. "The Word of God, say you, came out from this Church to *Antioch*, and to all the World, and from thence they had their Church Order, &c." But, 1. Was it the Worshipping Assembly of *Jerusalem*, Pastors and People that planted the Church at *Antioch*? This wants Proof. But, 2. What is the Inference from thence? Does it thence follow that *Antioch* was not a free Church, but subject to the Determinations of the Elders and People in *Jerusalem*? *the Church of Antioch, and its Presbytery, was subject to no Jurisdiction under Heaven in its Discipline* then, contrary to your own Principle, one Independent was subject to another. Again, you add *Ibid.* "The Apostles were in this Church, and with the Elders of this Church, where they began their Ministry, and settled all Matters of Importance, &c." But, 1. It must be proved that the Apostles, in this Matter, acted by an extraordinary and immediate Influence, as in the penning of the Scripture. The contrary of this I made appear, but it is overlooked by you. Will the Apostles, their being in this Church make any Man infer, that the Church of *Antioch* in which there were Apostles also, was subject unto the Church of *Jerusalem*? I am so far Independent, that I know no Scripture that authorizes one Church to have Authority over another

separat

separately considered ; and to imagine otherwise, favours too much of an extravagant Principle, held by a certain Church in the World.

Sir, I am wearied with such trifling, and am resolved to be no more with it ; so you may write and impose on the credulous as much as you have a mind ; but the Event of these Things is dangerous. In your Conclusion, I find, *Acts* 1. 6. cited as Proofs, that a worshipping Congregation has an immediate Concern and Title to give their Assent and Dissent in the Exercise of Discipline and Jurisdiction. But, 1. Consider and give a plain Answer to what I have said on these Texts, p. 230. 386. before you take for granted, they are subservient to your Purpose. You next cite *Acts* 11. 1,-4. but for what good Purpose, I know not, if it be not to put me in mind, that *Peter* endeavoured to satisfy the Jews at *Jerusalem*, of the Justness of his going unto the *Gentiles*, which no doubt was his Duty ; but by no good Consequence it will follow from thence, that Judicatories of Christ must suspend an Act of Discipline or Jurisdiction, till they obtain the Assent of every private Christian. To Support the same Thing, you set down *Matth.* 18. but take care all along to shift any direct Answer to what I have said on that Text. And then to conclude, you refer me to *Acts* 11. 22. Now, granting the Church, which is said to be informed about the Success of the Gospel at *Antioch*, was the Church at *Jerusalem* ; yet I refuse the Consequence, namely, That the *THEY* who sent forth *Barnabas*, were the whole Members of that Church. The whole Church might be informed ; yet the Authoritative Mission of *Barnabas* could

could only be by such as were vested with Power for that End. This Kind of Mission was not the Deed of all, as is plain from *Acts* 8. 14. where we find the Apostles sending forth *Peter* and *John* to *Samaria*, without the least Hint of the Churches Concern therein. If this Text prove any Thing, it proves too much, viz. That the whole Church were equally concerned, and acted the same Part in this Mission with the Apostles ; for the *THEY* are said to send them forth conjunctly, without the least Hint of one Part's acting authoritatively, and another merely by Consent. In a Word, the Apostle endites his Epistle to the Church of *Corinth*, when he appoints the Excommunication of the incestuous Man ; yet it was only the Deed of the Rulers of that Church. And *2 Cor.* 2. 6. it is called the Sentence of the *Chief Ones* ; and so the original Word is taken *Matth.* 6. 25. and 12. 41, 42. In fine, Churches are said to send Members to Councils, and yet the Deed of Mission was only that of the Rulers, as I could make evident in many Instances. As for *Acts* 15. Once answered what I have said about the *whole Church*, v. 22. before you take it for the *private Christian* or worshipping Assembly, and till then, *Cyprian's* Sentiments is of no Weight with me ; nor does he any where in his 6th Epistle, alledge any more than his own private Resolution for his Practice. Besides, his having purposed with himself from the first Time he entred on his Episcopate, to do nothing without the Counsel of the Presbyters, and the Consent of the People will never be an Argument that the People have a Negative on the Presbytery, or that each

the Church was to be personally present and give assent before any jurisdictional Act could be past. This was never the Practice of the Christian Church; so it is void of all Foundation in the sacred Oracles. I am very far from approving Ministers their lording it over God's Heritage; but at the same Time I know no Right the People have to a joint Concurrence in jurisdictional Management. This is void of Precedent, either under the Old or New Testament.

Sir, I have finished my Answer, and, I hope, an Agreeableness to my Promise in the Entry; and must now tell you, that more notorious Misrepresentations, base Calumnies, and uncharitable censures were never cast upon any Society of Men, than what you have done on that, of which once you was a Member; and am perswaded no Independent in the known World would have done the like but yourself. I leave it to others, who shall read your Conduct in this Missive, to judge, if the Methods pursued by you have the Appearance of one, who wrote *for the Sake of Faith*, and *as a Debt he owed to it*, p. 91. Candour in laying an Adversary's Mind and Words before the World, and citing the Places where they may be found, is somewhat agreeable to such a Pretence; but how much of this, and that of a fair Answer, is to be found in your Performance, I leave every Reader to judge. I remember I have heard it always as a Complaint on the Church of Rome, that when there was a History of the Council of Trent written out by an ingenuous Hand, which was not much for the Credit of that Interest, in the Counter-history they published, they took Care not to narrate the Pages opposed by them,

nor set down the exprefs Words ; and fo, when an
 Answer appeared, they could put them to run the
 Circle, and fay thefe were not the Places meant
 by them. I might alfo fay unto you, as *Auftin*
 to *Julian the Pelagian*, *Restore me my Words, and*
thy dreaming Imaginations will vanifh.

Sir, as I freely forgive your Treatment and
 unhandfom Practices ; fo I defire from the Heart
 to pray for you. I fhut up this Controverfy, by
 faying to you as *Cyprian* to *Florentinus*, *Epift. 66.*
p. 169. Habes tu literas meas, ego tuas ; in die
judicii ante tribunal Chrifti utraque recitabuntur.

Alyth, Feb. 1.
 1731.

Sir,
 Your moft humble Servant,

THOMAS AYTON.



POST.

SIR

Reason
 come
 Missiv
 the C
 Thing
 this I
 great
 which
 you ;
 fwers
 is adv
 disting

P O S T S C R I P T.

SIR, lest you should complain of my Brevity, I take here the Freedom to refer you to the *Answer of the Assembly of Divines unto the Reasons of the seven dissenting Brethren*, which is come into my Hand since the writing out of this Missive, and fully vindicates what I have said on the Church of *Jerusalem*, and, in a Word, every Thing else in Dispute between you and me. By this I do not design merely the Authority of so great and learned a Body of Orthodox Divines, which you have cautioned me not to use against you ; but the Weight and Solidity of their Answers to their Independent Brethren, and what is advanced by you, if it be not in some of your distinguishing Singularities.

F I N I S.





Fr^e Blyth m^y Calton

